



Robert Weale.

Library of the Theological Seminary,

PRINCETON, N. J.

Presented by Mr. William A. Wheelock of New York City.

BX 5455 .W5 v.12
Whately, Richard, 1787-1863.
Works ...



Richard Whately Works v.12.

CHARGES

AND

OTHER TRACTS.

BY

RICHARD WHATELY, D.D.

ARCHBISHOP OF DUBLIN.

LONDON:

B. FELLOWES, LUDGATE STREET.

MDCCCXXXVI.

LONDON :

R. CLAY, PRINTER, BREAD-STREET-HILL,
DOCTORS' COMMONS.

ADVERTISEMENT.

With the exception of the Sermon on behalf of the Association, all the Tracts in this Volume have been already published, at various times, as separate pamphlets. But some persons having expressed a wish to see them collected into a uniform volume, I have reprinted them, with the addition of a few notes and insertions.

The several Tracts are arranged, as far as that was possible, in reference to the subject matter, rather than to the order of time.

Palace, Dublin,
March, 1836.

CONTENTS.

PAGE

A CHARGE delivered to the Clergy of Dublin in June, 1834. 1
Notes 27

A CHARGE delivered to the Clergy of Dublin, in July, 1835 33
Note 59

ADDRESS to the Clergy of Dublin on Confirmation, in August, 1832 63
Note 77

ADDRESS to the Clergy of Dublin on Confirmation, in 1834 79

PAGE

Address to the Inhabitants of Dublin and its Vicinity, respecting the Lord's Day 99
Address of the Clergy of Dublin 120

National Education in Ireland 125
Prefatory Notice 127
Reply to the Memorial of the Dean and Chapter of St. Patrick's 135
Reply to a Memorial from the Clergy of Derry . 151
Reply to the Address of the Clergy of Dublin . . 154
Memorial 199
Address of the Clergy of Dublin 201
Memorial of the Clergy of Derry 209
Observations of the Bishops 212
Appendix and Notes 217

Appeal in behalf of the Association incorporated for Discountenancing Vice, &c. 229
Sermon in behalf of the Association 239

Tithes in Ireland 261
Prefatory Notice 263
Minutes of Evidence taken before the Select Committee of the House of Lords 265
Notes 415

PAGE

On the Jews' Relief Bill 419

Preface to the First Edition 421

A Speech in the House of Lords, August 1, 1833, on a Bill for the Removal of certain Disabilities from his Majesty's subjects of the Jewish persuasion 427

Additional Remarks 446

Observations made on presenting a Petition to the House of Lords from the Clergy of the Diocese of Kildare, relative to Church Reform, August 7, 1833 503

Appendix 518

A CHARGE

DELIVERED AT

THE PRIMARY VISITATION OF THE CLERGY OF THE DIOCESES OF DUBLIN AND GLANDELOUGH,

IN JUNE 1834.

Ἀληθεύοντες ἐν ἀγάπῃ.—Eph. iv. 15.

PRINCETON
THEOLOGICAL

A CHARGE,

&c. &c.

MY REVEREND BRETHREN,

If I were to set before you a lively picture of the various dangers and difficulties to which the Church is at this time exposed,* earnestly exhorting you, on that ground, to extraordinary efforts, and to redoubled zeal, vigilance, and caution, though I should, in this, be going over the mere common-places of an episcopal charge, yet no one, I think, could deny that such topics are not only suitable, but especially appropriate to the present crisis. Often as we have been told, formerly, of our lot being cast in perilous and trying times, and of

* See "Evidence," in the subsequent part of this volume.

the consequent call for increased exertions on the part of the ministry, the time is now at least arrived, when every one, I think, will be ready to admit, that all this may be urged with more reason than at any former period; at least for more than a century past. Not that this implies any censure of our predecessors, as having exaggerated the evils and the perils of their own times. It may have been true, that those times presented a more alarming aspect than any former period, though evils still more formidable may threaten our own.

But though the dangers, both external and internal, which now beset the Church to which we belong, are so manifest that I should not have any fear of being reckoned an alarmist, were I to dwell very strongly on them, this very circumstance makes it superfluous to do so. It is unperceived evils—unforeseen dangers—that men need to be warned against: and if I could suppose any of you to regard the present aspect of affairs with confident security, or careless apathy, I should not expect that such a man would be roused from it by any thing I could urge.

Still less is it my design to set before you a view of the ministerial duties generally, and urge you to the zealous and faithful discharge of them, in continual remembrance of the solemn account you will have to render to "the Chief Shepherd," in reference both to your private lives, and to the sacred office you have undertaken.

It is to be hoped you have thought much and deeply of these things, before you received Holy Orders; and that familiarity has not weakened the impression of such thoughts, since; but that what were good resolutions, will have ripened into practical good habits. But to any one who is insensible of such obligations as we lie under, or careless as to his own fulfilment of them, I am convinced that mere general exhortations to conscientious diligence, must always be addressed in vain. And to those, again, who are habitually and practically impressed as they ought to be, with a sense of their duties, all such general exhortations are unnecessary. Accordingly, any one precise and specific suggestion, even as to the most minute point, is of more value, if it contain any truth at all, than whole

volumes of vague, general, declamatory exhortations, however eloquent: because this latter is a kind of advice which no one can, strictly speaking, be said to *follow;* even though his conduct should, in fact, coincide with it.

And here, therefore, I will avail myself of the opportunity to offer, in passing, a brief hint as to the composition of sermons. Those who are sincerely desirous of producing a practical* good effect on their hearers, and who are not deficient in powers of thought or of expression, are sometimes misled as to what *is* practical; that is, what is really capable of producing an effect. If our hearers not only perfectly understand what we say, but also are in fact interested by it, and if they are capable of so thinking, and feeling, and acting, as we exhort them to do; and if, moreover, many of them display such a character as we recommend, we are in danger of at once concluding from this, that our discourses are practical, and that our advice has been followed: and yet it may possibly have been such, as in fact neither did, nor could, produce any

* See Note A. at the end of this Charge.

effect whatever. It may have been such as no one, strictly speaking, *follows*, except by accident. Of two persons who, without any concert or connexion, chance to be travelling the same road, one may, accidentally, be following the other; but not in the sense of being *led* by him, and following him as a *guide*. And it is only in the same accidental sense that any one can be said to follow any advice that consists of such vague and general exhortations, and descriptions of duty, as do indeed coincide with his conduct, but could have had no effect in producing it. He who should bid the husbandman bestow suitable tillage on his land, and sow the proper seeds, at the right seasons, without specifying what *is* suitable, and proper, and right, in each case, would manifestly produce no *effect;* because there is no one sufficiently skilful and industrious to *apply* such general precepts, who would not have dispensed with them altogether. And, in like manner, if a bishop in addressing the clergy, or they, their congregations, set before them merely such general precepts of Christian wisdom, and Christian virtue, as those alone have the ability and the will to *apply*,

whose head and heart would have led them to the very same course, had those precepts never been delivered—it is plain that while we flatter ourselves we are delivering practical discourses, we shall be producing no effect whatever.* We should ask ourselves on each occasion, not merely whether it is possible for a person to do, or be, or feel, what we recommend, but also whether our recommendations are so far definite, and specific, that it is possible some result may take place, (in those who are willing to listen to us,) in consequence of what we say, and which might have not equally taken place without our suggestion.

I will take this occasion, at the risk perhaps of being thought by some to violate the very rule just given, to suggest to you, (what, however obvious, we are perpetually tempted to overlook,) that the external condition of any church in respect of temporal prosperity or adversity, must not be confounded with its spiritual condition. A church may be (and this in fact has often happened) at once in a

* See Note B. at the end of this Charge.

flourishing, and in a decaying state, in reference to these two points respectively.

Now we all must be sensible that, as Christians, we *ought* at least to feel anxious for the safety and prosperity of the Establishment, with a view—and only with a view—to its utility in promoting Christian knowledge and Christian virtue:—that the temporal welfare, in short, of the Church, is the means, and its spiritual efficiency, the end. And in all cases men are prone to blend together in their minds the means and the end, even when these are not inseparable.

In the present case, we know with what triumphant activity the cause of evangelical truth was advancing, in the early churches, while the Apostles and their followers were, outwardly, depressed, despised, and persecuted; and would have been, had they "in this world only had hope in Christ, of all men most miserable."

On the other hand, our own Church, to go no further, was, before the Reformation, at the highest pitch of earthly splendour, wealth, and power; though inwardly and spiritually in the

most wretched state of languor and decay. When she said, "I have become rich, and have need of nothing, she knew not that she was wretched, and miserable, and poor, and blind, and naked."

With regard, then, to the temporal condition of our Church—the Establishment, considered as such, and merely in reference to its external welfare—the discussion of questions pertaining to this subject, would be so far of a political character, as not to be the most suitable to the present occasion. I will only remark, that I really believe the very best thing that can be done—at least, the best that can be done by *us*—with a view to the safety and permanence of the Establishment—is, to use in every way our utmost exertions to give it efficiency—to make it both to appear, and to be, a useful institution—*worthy* of public confidence and protection, as being of substantial benefit to the nation, in the inculcation of the knowledge and practice of religion: and that, of such religion as, by its fruits, may command the respect and esteem even of those who have little or nothing of religious feeling themselves. For the fruits

of truly evangelical religion can be in a great degree estimated, (as the Apostles themselves testify,) even by those who have little or no knowledge or care about the tree that produces them. It is thus that "by well-doing, (says the Apostle Peter,) ye may put to silence the ignorance of foolish men; that whereas they speak against you as evil-doers, they may glorify God on account of your good works which they shall see."

If such conduct on our part should fail to preserve our institutions, it will at least prove that they merit preservation; and whatever events it may please Providence to bring about —should even disaster and temporal ruin await the Establishment—those of us who shall thus have laboured to arrest that ruin, will not have laboured in vain, in the service of Him—the only Master, who is always ready to accept the sincere endeavour for the deed. "Let us behave ourselves valiantly for our Country, and for the cities of our God, and let the Lord do what seemeth good in his sight."

Whether the Church-establishment in this empire is destined to be speedily overturned, or

impaired, or to last in undiminished or increased vigour for ages, let no one of us, my Christian brethren, forget, that, to himself, the Established Church will, in a few short years, be no more. The endowments—the political preeminence—the earthly provisions for the support, and safety, and dignity of our Church—even though fated to remain through future generations—will, at any rate, in a few years, be at an end, as far as each one of us is personally concerned. But though the events of this world will then be nothing to us, it will be of the greatest concern to us, what our own conduct in this world shall have been. And he who does that, which, if all, or even most men, did the like, would make the whole church of Christ, in truth, a living Temple, fit for the habitation of the Holy Spirit, will be regarded by his Righteous Judge, as having accomplished that work: his efforts in his Master's cause, whether successful or not, will be accepted for that Master's sake; "and his Father, who seeth in secret, will reward him openly."

Let us not then, my Christian brethren, however outwardly disheartening the present aspect

of affairs, "be weary in well-doing; for in due season we shall reap if we faint not:" but, in respect of our endeavours, let us ever say, "thy kingdom come;" and, in respect of events, "thy will be done."

Of all the duties of a Christian, and especially of a Christian minister, there is none perhaps more particularly called for, at such a crisis as the present, than that to which our Lord attaches so preeminent a blessing—"Blessed," says He, "are the peace-makers; for they shall be called the sons of God." "If it be possible," says the Apostle accordingly, "as much as lieth in *you*, live peaceably with *all* men." But among Christians themselves, and especially fellow-members of the same Christian community, discord and party-spirit, wrath, bitterness, malice, evil-speaking, envyings, and such like, are continually put forward by the sacred writers, as most prominent marks of the "carnal mind, that is at enmity with God;" as the most strikingly contrasted with the fruits of the Spirit — charity, peace, long-suffering, gentleness, meekness—in short, with the character of the peace-makers. And if these are the children of

God, we might have inferred by parity of reasoning—even had we not been expressly taught, besides, in the rest of Scripture—*whose* children those in truth must be, who are occupied in kindling or keeping up strife.*

I have adverted on the present occasion, to this, at all times an essential portion of the Christian character, because in times like these, the duty I am speaking of is both peculiarly important, and also peculiarly difficult. It is peculiarly important, because nothing can more augment the danger of those who are fiercely assailed, or afford more triumph and advantage to their adversaries, than the display of mutual jealousies, and bitter intestine discord, accompanied with unchristian and intemperate violence, both against their opponents, and against each other. Those who "are sent forth as sheep among wolves," have need not only of

* *The Bishop.*—Will you maintain and set forwards, as much as lieth in you, quietness, peace, and love, among all Christian people, and especially among them that are or shall be committed to your charge?

Answer.—I will do so, the Lord being my helper.—*Ordination Service.*

"the wisdom of the serpent," but also of "the harmlessness of the dove."

And the duty is also peculiarly difficult to practise, because the provocations and trials of patience, which may be expected to arise at such a period, are, to most persons, unusually severe. Some of you may have been exposed, (owing to the peculiar circumstances of the times, which are such as to call into unusual activity many evil passions, that in a quieter season are comparatively dormant,) and others are liable to be hereafter exposed, to personal wrongs, or even to personal danger—to threats, to obloquy and slander from various quarters—to misrepresentation, virulent abuse, and, in short, every species of moral persecution. To stand calm amidst such storms as these, without being either intimidated or provoked—to preserve equanimity, and Christian firmness, combined with Christian meekness—neither daunted nor irritated by the attacks of adversaries, or the desertion of friends, requires an effort too great for the weakness of unaided human nature, and for which you must look for the support of Him, who bade his followers prepare to "take up the

cross and follow Him," and promised them strength from above to imitate his example.

But this is not the only difficulty. It is what one would less expect, but which yet experience tells us we *are* to expect, that men, when most violently assailed by a common enemy, are often disposed, instead of cordially combining their efforts for their joint preservation, to weaken themselves by the most bitter intestine discord, and to rage with increased fury against each other. We find the Christians at Corinth, while exposed to the hostility of their unbelieving neighbours, yet distracted by mutual jealousies, and torn by factious parties within themselves. We find the Jews, again, at the last siege of Jerusalem, as if possessed by demons, destroying their last hopes of safety, by the most furious contests with each other, while the Romans were beating down their walls:

> Ipsique suos, jam morte sub ægra,
> Discissos nudis laniabant dentibus artus.

May our Church, my Christian brethren, at this eventful crisis, not present to posterity this frightful and disgusting spectacle!

Di meliora piis, erroremque hostibus illum !

No precise rules can, of course, be laid down for distinguishing in each case, without the aid of moral tact, what is or is not unbecoming the character of Christian heroism;—for marking, with mathematical accuracy, the exact point of combination of uncompromising intrepidity, with Christian patience and forbearance. But for one who has been habitually cultivating this moral tact and Christian tone of sentiment, there are some passages of Scripture which, if impressed on the memory, and also on the heart, may prove of great practical utility, if habitually employed as a test.

I am the last who would recommend the practice of deducing doctrines or rules of conduct from insulated texts, interpreted without reference to the general tone of Scripture. But the sacred writings contain sundry precepts, which, after having been first carefully studied, and the true sense of them ascertained, and the spirit of them imbibed from comparison with the context, may afterwards be most profitably applied in the manner I have alluded to.

Apply *e. g.* as a test to any thing that has

been written, by yourself or by another, such precepts of Scripture as involve a description of the Christian temper. "Blessed are the meek:—blessed are the peace-makers:—blessed are the pure in heart:—the minister of the Lord must not strive, but be gentle unto all men: in meekness instructing them that oppose themselves:—Let this mind be in you which was also in Christ Jesus, who when He was reviled, reviled not again; when He suffered, He threatened not; but submitted himself to Him that judgeth righteously:—Let all bitterness, and wrath, and anger, and clamour, and evil-speaking, be put away from you, with all malice; and be ye kind one to another, tender-hearted, forgiving one another, even as God in Christ* hath forgiven you."†

Repeat, I say, to yourself, such passages as these, in conjunction with what you are reading, as a kind of test to "try the spirit, whether it be of God:" and if you are struck by the appearance of revolting incongruity and discrepancy between the two, our Lord's maxim

* Εν Χριστῳ. † See Note C. at the end of this Charge.

will hardly fail to occur to you:—" a good tree cannot bring forth evil fruit." If such a passage then be of your own writing, you will of course instantly erase it; with deep repentance, and with an earnest prayer that hereafter you may better know " what manner of spirit you are of," as a disciple of Christ. If it be something written against yourself, or any cause you are engaged in supporting, look narrowly into your own conduct, to see whether any intemperate violence or indiscretion on your part may have given occasion to the unjustifiable conduct of another; for his being unjustifiable, does not necessarily justify you. Fear not to be " persecuted and evil-spoken of, for righteousness-sake;" but take care that it *be* purely for righteousness-sake, and not from your neglecting to take heed that your good be not evil spoken of. But if it appear, on careful and candid examination, that there is no truth or justice in all that is said against you, rejoice in the Lord with thankfulness that this is the case. He has no where promised to preserve his disciples from obloquy and persecution; though his Spirit is ever ready to

keep them from deserving it. Rejoice that He has counted you worthy to partake of the same cup with Him; and has set before you his own example, of meekly enduring such reproaches from those who professed zeal towards God, as the most ingenious malignity never can possibly exceed. The Son of God, "who went about doing good," was represented as an agent of Satan. And copy that his example, in praying that it may please God to "forgive your enemies, persecutors, and slanderers, and to turn their hearts."

And lastly, if any thing that appears thus at variance with the spirit of the Gospel, and chargeable with unchristian bitterness, falsehood, or dishonest artifice,—if any thing of this kind proceed, not from an adversary, but from those engaged in a common cause with yourself, it is plainly your part, if possible, by advice and remonstrance to restrain such ill-advised advocates, (as Jesus did his followers, when about to call for fire from heaven on the Samaritans,) or if not, at least to testify your utter disavowal and deep reprobation. Both Christian prudence and Christian temper—the wisdom of the ser-

pent, no less than the harmlessness of the dove —will combine in deprecating the employment, in a good cause, of weapons, which are, in the end, as noxious to such a cause, as they are, from the first, unsuitable to it.

The course of procedure I have been describing, in reference to such cases as are likely to occur in times of much agitation, is such as I think the spirit of the Gospel would dictate to every *Christian,* whatever may be his situation in life. But by a Christian *clergyman,* this additional consideration should never for a moment be lost sight of: that we are, in *one* point, called on to set an example to the laity, not directly, but indirectly—I mean, in all that relates to the unchristian practice of duelling. Since, according to the rules of the worldly code of honour, a clergyman is exempted from the cruel alternative of either incurring worldly disgrace, or hazarding his own and his fellow-creature's life, in violation of the laws of God and his Country; hence, we cannot exhibit any *direct* example to those who are exposed to the trial we have not to undergo. And for this reason, I have always been convinced that the

exhortations of the clergy on this subject are utterly unavailing. However eloquently we may expose the absurdity of the practice—however clearly we may prove its unchristian character—the impression will never leave the minds of the hearers, that not only *they* cannot know, but even the preacher himself cannot know, whether he would have strength to act up to his own principles, were he exposed to that trial from which he is certain to be for ever exempt. His words therefore "pass by them as the idle wind, which they regard not."

How then shall he proceed? By *indirect* example he may produce the most beneficial effect. Let him exhibit not only such correctness of life, and scrupulous veracity, but such gentleness and courtesy of demeanour, as to prove, as far at least as *he* is concerned, that these results may be secured, independent of the check which duelling professes to supply; and the supposed *necessity* of which to the intercourse of civilized life, is the only plausible support of the practice. That a clergyman cannot be called upon to fight a duel, is what he should

never for a moment forget: he should remember it, not as a base mind would be apt to do, as affording a security for falsehood, for dishonourable conduct, or for insolence; but as a consideration which stamps such conduct with the additional brand of cowardly meanness. That violence of language, and overbearing harshness of demeanour, which is often falsely characterized as spirited behaviour, is (however unbecoming it may be to a Christian or a gentleman) in a layman, at least, an indication of a certain brutal courage, inasmuch as it exposes him to personal risk: in one who is secured from that risk, it is not only brutal, but base and cowardly brutality.

But a clergyman who scrupulously avoids every thing that could have brought on, had he *not* been a clergyman, this supposed necessity of an appeal to arms—who never gives just occasion to have it said, or insinuated, that his gown protects him, will have this satisfaction, in addition to the intrinsic rectitude, and Christian propriety of such conduct, that he is indirectly setting a good example in a point where his direct example could not avail: he is doing

perhaps not a little—at any rate, he is doing *all* that by a clergyman can be done—towards discountenancing and putting down a remnant of unchristian barbarism.

I will only add, in conclusion, a repetition of what I have said before to most of you, my Christian brethren, (not in words only, but I trust in my conduct also,) that you shall ever find me ready, to the best of my power, to assist, advise, consult, and cooperate with all and each of you, in every good work; and to promote, as far as my ability extends, the most cordial union, and brotherly kindness among all the members of our Church. I can safely say that there will be no want of sincere, and single-hearted, and friendly, and harmonious cooperation among us, if the clergy and their several congregations will be but ready to evince the same disposition towards me, which they will always find in myself towards them.

I entreat you therefore, my Christian brethren, to unite your prayers with mine, that we may be blessed with this spirit of Christian concord: I entreat you not to repeat as a mere outward ceremonial form, the prescribed words of

supplication in favour of "Bishops, and Curates, and Congregations committed to their charge;" but to offer up from your inmost heart, with sincere faith, and confident hope, and fervent charity, your prayers that our Church may be defended, if not from temporal disasters, and assaults from without, at least from spiritual calamity, and "from envy, hatred, and malice, and all uncharitableness," displayed by her own members, whether towards their opponents, or towards each other. He who has promised to be with us "always, even unto the end of the world," and before whose tribunal we shall then have to appear, together, to give an account of our stewardship; and who is now in the midst of those sincerely gathered together in his Name, has promised that if we shall agree touching something we shall ask for, in His name, it shall be given us by his Heavenly Father. Let us agree then, my Christian brethren, to ask of Him, to whom all hearts are open, all desires known, and who hears the prayers that never pass the lips, to grant us his promised peace; to bless us with mutual concord; and to guide us with his heavenly wisdom,

and support us by his heavenly strength, in the midst of all the difficulties and dangers with which He may be pleased to try us in our passage through this world.

NOTES.

Note A.—Page 6.

It may be necessary here to observe, that by a "practical discourse," I mean any that is calculated to influence either the outward conduct, or the motives, sentiments, temper, affections — in short, the inward moral character or disposition of the hearer. Such, I believe, is the sense most correctly attached to the word "practical;" but I have added this distinct declaration of my meaning, because some persons are in the habit of employing the word in reference to mere external conduct alone, without any reference to the inward principles from which it proceeds. And yet every one, I think, is ready to acknowledge, on a moment's reflection, that it is the *motive* alone that can stamp the character of virtuous or vicious on any action; nay, and that it is the motives themselves—the principles and designs of the agent, and not the actions, that are primarily and properly designated as morally good or evil. A man, for instance, who fires a gun at another, with intent to assassinate him, is, morally speaking, not the less a murderer, though he should chance to miss his aim:

nor is he the less a patriot, morally, who uses his best endeavours to benefit his country, though his efforts should fail of success.

But men so often deceive, both others, by empty professions, and themselves, by general good intentions, which fail when the time of trial comes, that we are naturally led to look to actions as the test of character; and thence, not only to apply, but to confine, to the external actions, the title of virtuous or vicious, which properly belongs to the disposition of the agent.

But still, we are fully aware, on reflection, that the outward actions are only so far morally good or evil, as they are a sign of what is within—that it would be absurd to attribute moral agency to a machine which should perform its work with the utmost regularity; and that a practical good effect has been produced even on any one who had been already acting rightly in some point, but on inferior motives, when he is induced to pursue the very same line of conduct on higher and purer principles. Whatever produces a change of the heart, has produced not only a practical effect, but, as far as the agent himself is concerned, the greatest of all practical effects.

It may be also necessary to observe, that I do not mean to restrict the term "morality" (according to a very common abuse of language) to the control of the sensual appetites. "Virtuous" and "vicious" are often thus confined in their application; but I call this an abuse of language, because no one, I think, would deliberately affirm that there is no vice in indulging, or

virtue in restraining, the worldly, and the more truly diabolical propensities: such as covetousness, vanity, falsehood, arrogance, envy, malice, and cruelty.

From overlooking these truths, though so obvious when stated, *casuists* in particular have often fallen into hurtful errors, by distinguishing venial from mortal sins according to the *amount e. g.* of money stolen, or the like, rather than according to the disposition of the agent.

Note B.—Page 8.

I have elsewhere made nearly the same remark in other words:—"It is an admonition which probably "will give offence to some, and excite the scorn of "others, but which I cannot but think may sometimes "prove useful to a young preacher, that he should ask "himself, at the beginning, and in the course of his "composition, 'for *what purpose* am I going to preach? "Wherein would any one be a loser, if I were to keep "silence? Is it likely that any one will learn something "he was ignorant of, or be reminded forcibly of some-"thing he had forgotten, or that something he was "familiar with shall be set before him in a new and "striking point of view, or that some difficulty will have "been explained, or some confused ideas rendered clear; "or, in short, that I shall at all have edified any one? "Let it not be said, that I preached because there *was* "*to be* a sermon, and concluded when I had said enough "to—occupy the requisite *time*; careful only to avoid

" any thing that could excite censure, and content to " leave the hearers just as I found them. Let me not " be satisfied with the thousandth iteration of common- " places, on the ground that it is all very *true*, and that " it is the fault of the congregation if they do not believe " and practise it; for all this is equally the case, whether " I preach or not; and if all I say is what they not only " knew before, but had heard in the same trite and " general statements an hundred times before, I might as " well hold my peace. I ought not to be considering " merely whether these arguments—motives—doctrines, " &c., are *themselves* likely to produce an effect; but " whether *my urging* them will be likely to make any " difference as to the effect. Am I then about to preach " merely because I want to say something, or because I " have something to say?'

" It is true, a man cannot expect constant success in " his endeavours, but he is not very likely to succeed in " any thing that is not even the object of his endea- " vours."—*Elements of Rhetoric, Part III. Chap. 3,* § *2.*

Note C.—Page 18.

When any one feels himself deeply wronged, by unprovoked hostility, or, still more, by base desertion, and requital of evil for good, he is of course strongly tempted to give way to resentment, and perhaps to cherish it under the more specious name of virtuous INDIGNATION. And certainly he ought not to combat

this feeling by labouring to stifle any such sentiment of moral disapprobation as really is virtuous; by explaining away the distinctions of right and wrong, and seeking to practise the duty of forgiveness by persuading himself that there is little or nothing to forgive. It may be advisable then, in such a case, instead of either thus glossing over moral turpitude, or again, yielding to the inclination to complain bitterly, or perhaps to revile and execrate,—that one should accustom himself to say, where there is manifestly just ground for complaint, "that man owes me an hundred pence!" (Matt. xviii. 28.) This will at once recall to our mind the parable of him who rigorously enforced his own claims, when he had been forgiven a debt of ten thousand talents.

A CHARGE

DELIVERED TO

THE CLERGY OF THE DIOCESES OF DUBLIN AND GLANDELOUGH, AT THE VISITATION

IN JULY, 1835.

Πολλὴν ἐν Χριστῷ παῤῥησίαν ἔχων ἐπιτάσσειν σοι τὸ ἀνῆκον, διὰ τὴν ἀγάπην μᾶλλον παρακαλῶ.

Ep. Philem. ver. 8, 9.

TO

THE VENERABLE J. TORRENS, D. D.

ARCHDEACON OF DUBLIN.

Dear Mr. Archdeacon,

It has afforded me great satisfaction to receive, through you, an application on behalf of yourself and a number of the Clergy, requesting the publication of my Charge. Their approbation of my well-meant endeavours to promote their welfare and their usefulness, holds out a cheering hope of the success of those endeavours, through the means of an harmonious and successful cooperation between us.

I may add, that, in a Country which is unhappily so generally regarded as the very seat of reckless and all-absorbing party-spirit, the esteem and confidence manifested by the Clergy towards one who has ever kept aloof from all parties, ecclesiastical and political, cannot, I think, but redound to their credit, and to the safety of the Establishment.

Believe me to be,

DEAR MR. ARCHDEACON,

Yours very faithfully,

RICHARD DUBLIN.

PALACE, DUBLIN,
July, 1835.

A CHARGE,

&c. &c.

MY REVEREND BRETHREN,

THE subject of our Church Establishment, and its present situation—the difficulties, and dangers, and uncertainty in which it is involved—to which I briefly adverted in my address to you last year, is one on which, deeply interesting as it is, it would be useless to enlarge on an occasion such as this; because it does not mainly rest with us, the Clergy, as such, to remove or prevent the evils in question. The spiritual well-being and efficiency of our Church is *our* special concern. Not but that we may, by our attention to this, our proper department, contribute something towards the temporal welfare of the

Establishment also; we may, by showing ourselves patterns of Christian knowledge and zeal, combined with christian meekness and discretion, —by displaying the wisdom of the serpent united with the harmlessness of the dove—and by promoting the growth of these fruits of the Christian spirit in our flocks,—do something towards impressing on the minds of the nation at large, and of the Legislature, a conviction of the utility of our Establishment.* But our exertions in this way, whether they contribute much or little towards such an end, ought to have a far higher end proposed,—and should spring from a far nobler motive than any that worldly objects can supply. To save the souls of ourselves, and of those committed to our care, ought to be, and we should show that we feel it to be, our ultimate end; and we should endeavour to impress on our people our own practical conviction of what we teach, when we bid them not be "busy and troubled about many things," when "one thing is needful."

You will not, I trust, imagine that I am disposed to join in the popular declamation that is so

* See Note at the end of this Charge.

prevalent, respecting the alleged covetousness and worldliness of the Clergy, and the extraordinary disinterestedness and even ascetic self-mortification that is to be fairly expected of them: as if the same degree of care for securing a respectable maintenance, and a provision for a family, which are regarded as allowable, and even laudable, in men of all other classes, were to be severely reprobated in the Clergy; or as if these were characterized and distinguished from the laity by a greater degree of devotedness to worldly objects. The prevalence of this kind of declamation, which has been considered as a sign of the times,—and perhaps, in its precise form and degree may be such,—I am rather disposed to regard as a sign of human nature. For I know of no times or Countries in which it has not been characteristic of "the natural man," that any one class of persons should delight in dwelling on the virtues required, and the deficiencies exhibited, in another class; and should readily turn aside their attention from their own duties and their own faults to those of some other order of men. For this reason, I should think it right to dwell on different topics in addressing, respectively,

the Clergy and the Laity. Not that truth is any where to be lost sight of or distorted; but that the same truths are not equally needed to be impressed on the minds of different descriptions of hearers. Our Lord accordingly did not occupy the Pharisees with an exposure of Sadducean errors, nor the Sadducees with rebukes of Pharisaical hypocrisy; He did not, in addressing Jews, dwell on the superior claims of the temple at Jerusalem to that on Mount Gerizim, nor declaim to the Samaritans against the bigoted nationality of the Jews; but in his discourses to each, enlarged on such topics as might be, to each, most profitable. Had it been his object to gain popularity—to interest and gratify his hearers, instead of profiting them, his method would of course (for the reason just given) have been the very reverse.

And I have no doubt accordingly that to many an assembly of Laymen much gratification might be afforded by an eloquent declamation on the grasping and secular character of the Clergy,—on the unreasonableness of their not being contented with the bare necessaries of life,—or without them,—and on the *example* of humble and

austere self-denial that is to be expected from them; all, without any hint of the duty of *following* such an example. For it is remarkable that there is a strange sort of impropriety in the popular use of the word *exemplary*, as applied to the character and conduct of the Clergy. It is generally confined to what is *not* really *exemplary*,—to whatever points are considered as characteristic of the Clergy, and *peculiar* to *them*, and never meant to be *imitated* by the Laity.*

On the other hand, to any of the Clergy who might be under the influence of this human infirmity, an eloquent detail of the claims, and rights, and good deserts of our own Order, and of the corresponding duties of the Laity, would be likely to be more acceptable, than an exposition of our own temptations and our own responsibility.

It is my object, however, not to court the favour, or to minister to the present gratification of either class; but to promote the substantial benefit of each, whenever opportunity may occur. I will therefore take this occasion, my Reverend Brethren, merely to suggest to you the point of

* See Romish Errors, ch. ii. § 11.

view which, I think, is every way the wisest and best in which you can contemplate, and endeavour to lead others to contemplate, the temporal endowments of the Church. For as these may be regarded in two lights, *viz.* as a benefit either to the actual holders of the endowments, or to the Community, for whose sake they were bestowed, it is plain that this latter view is that which ought to be considered as the primary and essential, and also as the more consonant both to the safety of the Establishment and to the dignity of the Clergy. I say that this is the most correct and truest view that can be taken, because any one who founds, *e. g.* a College, or School, or Professorship, is always supposed to have in view, as his primary and essential object, the benefit, not of the individual tutors, masters, &c. who may from time to time be the immediate holders of the endowments, but of the Public, who are to profit by their instructions. He is regarded as a benefactor to the *students*, not (except incidentally) to the professors or other teachers. And the same is the view which I think it is the most fair, as well as the most prudent, to take of the endowments of our Church.

Let its claim of protection for those endowments be rested on their utility; and be set forth as a claim (which, in truth, it is) on behalf of the *People*, rather than of the Ministers. With whatever sacred inviolability, distinct from this plea of usefulness, the endowments of the Church may, in the judgment of any one, be invested, I would only suggest,—without entering into any discussion of questions under that head—that the claim which I have recommended to be put forward is the only one that is likely to be urged with practical effect. If the Church endowments be upheld, we may be assured it will have been from a conviction on the part of the Legislature and the Nation of their being needful for the benefit of the Congregations. Should this plea fail of effect, we may be assured no other will avail.

I will not enter further into the discussion of any questions relative to the temporalities of the Church; which is not the subject to which I wish on this occasion to direct your principal attention.

Nor again do I design, on this any more than on the former occasion, to occupy your time with a delineation of the character to be aimed at—

the duties to be performed—by an individual Clergyman, and by exhortations to right conduct in that capacity: because (as I then remarked) those who have already reflected,—as I trust you have,—on the awfully responsible nature of your sacred Profession, would have little need of such descriptions and admonitions: and those who have not, would be unlikely to profit by them now.

I wish rather to call your attention to that line of conduct which you may adopt, not individually but combinedly, with the best prospect of benefiting both the Church to which we belong, and through that, the Public at large.

It is obviously a duty, and an advantage, for the members of *any* society, under all circumstances,—more especially for the Clergy of a Christian Church, and most of all when that Church is so situated as ours is at present,—to live in harmony—to assist each other—to act in concert as much as possible,—and to cooperate as *one* united Body, guided by the same principles, and conforming to the same regulations.

All would probably admit this in the abstract; and all would perhaps be ready to act on that admission, in the case of any community—could

there be any such—whose constitution and whose governors should not only *be*, but should *appear* to every individual member of that community—so perfect as to admit of no conceivable improvement. But this we know to be an impossibility. For even if a system absolutely perfect could be established, which none could be, subsequent to the removal of the Apostles, —the inspired and unerring founders and governors of the earliest Christian Churches,—still, as we learn from the experience of what took place, even in the times of those very Apostles, many would be found disposed to "walk disorderly," and disregard its regulations.

But in our Church (as in any other community whose regulations are framed by fallible mortals) it is not pretended that all its enactments are, even in themselves, so perfect as to preclude all possibility of improvement.

Let it be considered, then, what is the duty of individuals who are members of *such* a community;—of individuals situated, as every member of *any* church must, more or less, be situated, as long as man shall continue fallible, and the institutions of human wisdom fall short of

unerring perfection. Shall we openly withdraw from the community we belong to, on the ground of its not realizing those ideas of perfection which no constitution that is, in any degree, of man's framing, ever can realize? Or shall we, though not avowedly yet virtually, withdraw from it, by taking no part, and manifesting no interest in its common concerns, till every thing that seems to us an imperfection shall have been completely remedied? Or again, shall we exert ourselves indeed in promoting the objects proposed, but exert ourselves either singly as insulated individuals, or in irregular combinations, setting at nought the institutions and regulations of the community, and in defiance of its legitimate governors? In all these ways, it is manifest we should be professing concord and church-unity in words, while we were destroying it by our conduct. We should be maintaining a mere nominal and hypothetical kind of christian harmony; to be then only displayed in practice when every part of the constitution of the Church should be modelled precisely according to our own judgment and our own wishes.

Far different surely is the wise policy, and

(what in this case comes to the same point) the bounden duty, of each member of any community—and not least, of each member—more especially each minister—of a Church which he does not deem so radically corrupt in doctrine or in discipline as to oblige him to forsake it. It should be his endeavour, in the first place, to avail himself as far as possible of all its existing regulations and institutions, towards promoting beneficial objects; and in the next place, to do all he can (not only as a single individual, but in combination with his fellow-members of the Church) in furthering those objects, under the control at least, if not with the aid, of the established regulations, and keeping within the bounds which they prescribe. And if in any case the cooperation of other members, and especially of the regular governors of the Church, in any beneficial measure, shall have been sought in vain, we should regard it as a matter of consolation that at least it has been sought. While we regret the absence of their aid in what we consider a good work, we should secure to ourselves, at least the satisfaction of feeling that the fault, if there be any, rests with them, and not with ourselves.

And if, again, we find in any case our useful exertions apparently crippled by what may seem to us the injudicious regulations of the Society, it is for us to deliberate attentively—to reflect solemnly—*which* is, in such a case, the more advisable and the more justifiable side of the alternative; to forego some advantages, and submit to some inconveniences, in obeying the laws of our society, while they continue to *be* its laws, though they are not such as we fully approve, and though we are taking steps to obtain an alteration of them; or, for the sake of some particular benefit, to violate a general obligation, and thus loosen the whole fabric of the Body of which we are members, by setting an example of irregularity and disunion. For it is evident that to adopt this latter course, is to introduce a principle which each will afterwards apply according to his own discretion, one in one way and another in another; and which utterly nullifies all professions of allegiance, subordination, and unanimity. Every one must see what an empty name must be that of discipline, in an army of which each soldier should be ready to obey orders only just so far as they might chance to

fall in with his own views of what was most advisable, and should violate them without scruple in compliance with the suggestions of his own judgment. And every one, I may add, must perceive how little, in such an army, would avail, the valour and activity of soldiers quitting their ranks at pleasure, and acting, each as his own general, either singly, or in small self-formed bodies of irregular volunteers; and what irretrievable confusion and ultimate ruin must be the result.

I have thought it right, for the sake of giving a clear view of the argument, to suppose the case (and it certainly is at least a supposable one) of a church whose constitution is chargeable with some defects. How far, or whether at all, such a description will apply to the constitution of our own Church, and how far any alleged defects may be remediable or irremediable, are questions which I have purposely and carefully abstained from discussing; because I wish to rest the duty of conformity to existing regulations, not on the perceived *expediency* or perfection of each,—a point on which we may expect that there will always be some differences of opinion, but on a ground less likely to be disputed, their *existence;*

on their being, actually, whether wise or unwise, regulations of the Society we belong to, and as such, claiming our obedience.

I will only add one remark to what I have said on this subject: that no one should regard with suspicious aversion that loyal compliance with the subsisting rules of the community, while they continue to *be* its rules, which I have urged as a duty incumbent on all its members,—no one, I say, should regard this with suspicion, as tending to prevent the reformation of defects, and to perpetuate unwise laws. Quite the contrary. Nothing tends more to prevent the regular abrogation or alteration of unwise laws than the irregular infringement or evasion of them. Nothing is more conducive not only to the maintenance of what is good, but also to the amendment of what is evil, in any of our institutions, than a scrupulous conformity to them while they subsist. If every member either of a civil or of an ecclesiastical community would make it a point of conscience both to obey, in each *particular* point, the laws while they continue to be laws, and also to use his best endeavours in a regular way, for the *general* amendment of any thing he might think

faulty, the community would gain much not only in point of healthful firmness and stability, but also in point of susceptibility, of growth and improvement.

Unhappily, the conduct of most men is the very reverse of this. Instead of labouring to improve the regular public high roads, or to amend the direction of them, each is ready to break a path for himself as his own convenience may suggest. If the inexpediency of any law is pointed out to him, and he is urged, on public grounds, to use his endeavours to procure the regular alteration of it, he will perhaps plead that he is not bound to trouble himself about that which is no special concern of his: and yet the inexpediency of that very law he will perhaps plead as an excuse for the unscrupulous violation of it in any particular case where it may interfere with his private convenience.

To those of more mature age and judgment among the Clergy, I look with confident hope that they will aid me in pressing these principles on the minds of their younger and less experienced brethren, who might be the more likely on that account to overlook their importance. And in

all points, I exhort the older and more experienced labourers in the vineyard to be ready—not indeed officiously to obtrude, but freely to afford, their advice to those who are entering on the ministry. Indeed, I would remind all of you that you have a duty not only to your congregations, but to each other, in striving, each, to further, as far as may be done without arrogant assumption and offensive intrusion, the improvement in Christian learning and wisdom, and ministerial usefulness, of his fellow-labourers. In all these matters, much must rest with you, my Reverend Brethren, though no exertions on my part ever have been or shall be wanting towards increasing the usefulness of the Clergy; either by seeking to advance and facilitate their clerical education, or by favouring the improvement, or the opening under suitable regulations, of places of worship, or by any other means within my reach. And I have also used, and will use, my best endeavours to fulfil the duty to which I am especially bound by vow: "to maintain, as far as in me lieth, quietness, peace, and love, among all men, and especially among the Clergy of the diocese committed to my care."

I have taken every precaution accordingly, by which litigation and contention of any kind among the members of our Church, and especially among the Clergy, may be guarded against. For if it was accounted a scandal in the Church of Corinth that Christians should go to law with Christians about matters purely secular, still more disgraceful to one at least of the parties concerned, if not to both, must be contention among *ministers* in respect of *spiritual* matters.

Having called your attention particularly to the importance of harmonious and cordial co-operation—of combined exertions in our common cause, I will not let pass this opportunity of informing you, which I do with much satisfaction, that I have every reason to believe there will be, at the suggestion of the Lord Primate, a general meeting this year,* and also in each succeeding year, of the Bishops of this portion of the united Church; for the purpose of mutual consultation on those various points from time to time arising, on which it is so important that the governors of the Church should, as far as

* The meeting for the present year took place (owing to peculiar circumstances) in London, in the month of July.

possible, proceed on common principles, and act in concert as one Body. Such an assembly will not indeed have power, like a legislative Body, to bind the minority—in case of any irreconcileable difference of opinion—by the decision of the majority. But in the event of unanimity on any question that may arise, each will derive that support in his decision, which, for the benefit of the Church, he ought to derive, from his ascertained agreement with his brethren, and from being able to calculate on their practical cooperation. And whether unanimous or not, the ultimate deliberate determination of each will at least derive, and deservedly, additional weight from its being known to have undergone calm discussion, and not to have been adopted without an opportunity, at least, being afforded of weighing the reasons on both sides. And each Bishop will thus have also an opportunity, of which I for one, (as well as, no doubt, my brethren on the Bench,) shall gladly avail myself—of laying before the rest the ascertained views both of the Clergy of his own diocese generally, and of those in particular where experience, and ability, and tried Christian character,

may have entitled them to be more especially consulted.

With respect to yourselves, my Reverend Brethren, and indeed to all the Clergy of the united Church, when I offer my cordial cooperation with all or any of you, in any plan of proceeding that may further the great business to which we have devoted ourselves,—my advice in any case of doubt and difficulty that may occur,—my aid towards reconciling differences, and facilitating your cooperation with each other,—and, finally, when I offer to give a fair hearing to any proposals or suggestions that may be the result of Christian zeal combined with careful deliberation,—when I offer all this, I trust I shall not be understood,—nay, I claim not to be understood—as uttering mere words of course, which do not represent the genuine sentiments of my heart, or which will not be realized by my conduct. I claim this, because I have now been long enough among you, to establish, I trust, in some degree, this claim. Some of you are able to bear testimony from experience that I am ready to make good my professions of forwardness to cooperate with and further your Christian

exertions; and no one, I think, can say that, on making trial, he has found his well-meant endeavours (whether my judgment may have coincided, or not, with his) treated with indifference and disregard; or that any thing had been rejected unheard which in any way deserved a hearing.

In this, and I believe in some other points, I have reason to hope that my views are by many persons better understood,—my sentiments and motives more fairly appreciated than they were, or than perhaps I could expect they should be, when I first came among you. For your sakes, and for that of our Christian brethren, I rejoice in this hope. As far as I am concerned, "it is a small thing for me to be judged of you, or of man's judgment; yea, I judge not mine own self; but he that judgeth me is the Lord."* But though I have to look to a higher and more awful, and an unerring tribunal, I am sensible how important it is, with a view to the benefit of others, that I should obtain your approbation, and confidence, and cordial support.

I will therefore conclude with the very words

* 1 Cor. iv. 3.

which I had occasion to address to some of you above three years ago.* After remarking how little any exertions of mine could avail without the cooperation of the Clergy, I added—" And this cooperation, I may confidently say, I shall obtain, if they will be as ready on their part, as I shall ever be on mine. I wish for no more of brotherly kindness and candour than I am ready myself to manifest towards them; I am always glad to avail myself of their advice, and to put the most favourable interpretation on what they say and do; I have laboured, and I trust not altogether in vain, to vindicate them in the eyes of the Public from unjust imputations: whatever influence I possess (which, however, is no more than that of a man without any personal or political claims on government) I have exerted in favour of what I have thought their just demands: I am desirous to concur with them as far as I can; and, when compelled to differ from any of them in opinion, to differ without hostile and uncharitable feelings: and I ask but the same in return."

These words were uttered then, and they are

* *Vide infra*, Reply to Address of Clergy, in 1832.

repeated now, in perfect sincerity and truth. May God grant that the wishes and hopes implied in them may be more and more realized on each succeeding year! May he deliver both me and you from the fearful responsibility of having presented any hinderance to the fulfilment of such hopes!

NOTE.

PAGE 38.

I ALLUDE for instance (among others) to the argument of those who rest the claims of the Establishment principally on the *truth* and purity of the doctrines of our Church. Now,—not to mention that this argument will not be admitted by those members of the legislature who are of a different religion—it can hardly be supposed that a majority even of those of them who are of our communion, would consent to follow up the principle of the argument;—would acquiesce, for instance, in the division of our East Indian territories into 20,000 or 30,000 parishes, with a sufficient endowment in each for the maintenance of a Minister of our Church; who would in most instances be without a congregation. And yet our doctrines must be as *true* in Hindostan as they are here.

Now should any one attempt to draw such a parallel as this, it would be replied, most justly, that there is a wide difference in the circumstances of Hindostan and of Ireland; in which the number of members of our Church is such that the aggregate revenue of all the livings,—

though it might be desirable to see it better distributed—is not more than sufficient for the wants of all the congregations.

This is perfectly true: and it is this truth that I wish to see prominently put forward and dwelt on, instead of being kept out of sight by a mode of reasoning quite unconnected with it. It is precisely because there is this wide difference between the cases of Ireland and of Hindostan, that I deprecate the use of an argument which is equally applicable to both. The mischievous delusion which represents ours as a *sinecure* Establishment, is evidently fostered by its being defended on principles which would no less apply if it *were* such. However sound those principles may in fact be, we have no reason to hope they will be *admitted*, so as to lead to any practical good effect.

Some persons, again, are accustomed to deny the *right* of the Legislature to interfere at all with Church-property, and will not recognise the authority of the civil government over the temporalities of the Establishment. Now this again is a principle, we should remember, which would be equally applicable if the number of the Protestants in Ireland were but the hundredth part of what it is, and the revenues of the Church one hundred times greater. For if there be any property which I have absolutely no right to interfere with, it is nothing to the purpose to inquire into its amount, or whether it be wasted, or beneficially expended.

But to waive the question as to the soundness of this view,—it is at least a safer and more prudent course to

remonstrate against an unfair and unwise *exercise* of the rights which the Legislature claims, than to dispute the claim, in a case where the dispute must be decided by the very claimant itself. All must admit that there are cases in which a person does possess a right which he sometimes does not rightly exercise. Whenever, for instance, a law is proposed to any legislative Body, which they *have the right* of either enacting or rejecting, it would be a manifest absurdity to say that they would be *equally right in doing either* the one or the other. I myself, indeed, have always maintained that every Civil Government *has* a control (though sometimes very ill administered) over temporalities: and on the other hand, that it has *not* a control over men's consciences;—no right to attempt to enforce or prohibit, by any kind of penalties, any particular religion. And those who deny *both* these positions;—who, while they place the religious faith of the subjects within the province of the Civil Magistrate, and leave it to him to decide what tenets are true, and to prescribe to them what *religion* they shall profess, yet deny his right to exercise any control over the *temporalities* of the Church, as something too sacred for his interference,—such persons do appear to me to reverse our Saviour's maxim, and to say, "Render unto Cæsar the things that are God's, and unto God the things that are Cæsar's." But I am ready on this occasion to waive the question as to the soundness of such arguments as I have been alluding to; as I wish merely to point out how unlikely it is that they can be urged with any practical good effect.

ADDRESS

TO

THE CLERGY OF THE ARCHDIOCESE OF DUBLIN,
AND DIOCESE OF GLANDELOUGH,

IN AUGUST 1832.

Αὐξάνετε δὲ ἐν χάριτι καὶ γνώσει.

ADDRESS,

&c. &c.

MY REVEREND BRETHREN,

HAVING brought to a close the business of the Confirmations, which has occupied, with little intermission, a period of six weeks,* I will not forego this opportunity of addressing you, to express my satisfaction at the careful arrangements made in each of the churches, to ensure the orderly and decorous celebration of the holy ordinance.

* It was found advisable to hold Confirmations in a greater number of churches than usual, in order to avoid inconvenient crowds; the candidates being very numerous, from the rite not having been administered during several years of the late Archbishop's declining health.

I have also to return my thanks, personally, for a kind and friendly reception, and for the hospitality which was offered me in more instances than I was able to accept.

Of the due preparation of the candidates for Confirmation, I can, of course, (with the exception of a few instances) judge only from your report: but their external behaviour was for the most part such as to encourage the most satisfactory hopes of their being both well-instructed in their religion, and duly impressed with the sentiments appropriate to the solemn occasion.

With respect to the *age* of the candidates, and the interpretation of our rubric's direction, that they should be of a "competent age," I have indeed already been consulted by some of you, and have in reply stated my view of the question; which, however, it may be as well to take this opportunity of laying before you.

I do not conceive it right to exclude any child from Confirmation merely on the ground of his not having reached a certain determinate age, supposing him to have both such a degree

of religious knowledge, and also such religious sentiments, and seriousness of mind, as may be deemed requisite. Our rubric, in the Office of Baptism, directs, "that this child shall be brought to the bishop to be confirmed, *so soon as* he can say the creed," &c. &c. We must not indeed suppose nothing more to be meant than the mere learning the words by rote: to "say" the creed, &c. must be understood (according to the spirit, and not the bare letter, of the expression) to include a proper understanding and feeling of what is said. But it does seem to be meant, that "so soon as" this due preparation is accomplished, the child, of whatever age, shall be brought to Confirmation.

In my own parish, I have known a few instances of children under eleven years of age, who were in every respect quite as well prepared for Confirmation as any of the other candidates. This, I am aware, can but rarely be expected to occur; but children of that age, or of any age, should not be, according to the spirit of the rubric, kept back from Confirmation, or again, admitted to it, on account of the less or greater

number of years each has lived, but according to their state of preparation. For if our Reformers had thought it right that a rule *should* be laid down specifying the earliest allowable age, I cannot but think they would have specified that age *themselves.*

I trust nothing I have said will be construed as countenancing the practice, (which cannot be too much condemned) of hastily giving tickets for Confirmation to candidates ill-prepared, or whose state of preparation has not been duly ascertained. In fact, the less regard we shew to the *age* of the candidates, the more we shall turn their thoughts to that which is really essential, the religious knowledge and sentiments they possess. If it is well understood that none are to be *rejected* merely on the score of *youth*, it will be understood also that none are to be *admitted* merely on the ground of their being of full *age.**

One circumstance I am aware—the long intervals between Confirmations—has a natural tendency to occasion the premature admission

* See Note at the end of this Address, p. 77.

of some candidates, and the too great delay of the rite in respect of others. This cause will not, I trust, again occur; as it is my full intention, with the divine blessing, to administer Confirmation in all parts of the diocese, at the interval of one, or at most, of two years.

One reason which has in some instances been assigned for not bringing forward some children so soon as they might be considered sufficiently prepared, has, I confess, considerable weight; viz. that they may not be too early withdrawn from the classes in which they receive catechetical instruction. You will perhaps however find means of continuing to afford some kind of regular religious instruction suited to the younger portion of your parishioners, even after they have been confirmed; whether along with, or apart from, the candidates for Confirmation. And it is a point of especial importance to guard constantly, and in every way, against the notion which is continually tending practically to insinuate itself into the mind, that those who, with due preparation, have received Confirmation, and have attended at the Lord's table, have accomplished every thing that demands any

anxious attention. No one indeed is likely to avow this belief, even to himself, in so many words. But nothing can be more fully evinced by experience than that an indolent and contented security, and spiritual-pride, are apt to take the place of zealous vigilance, and unceasing efforts "to *grow* in grace," and in religious knowledge.

And this is a temptation which more especially besets those who have made the earliest proficiency in all that relates to their spiritual concerns; or who have undergone the most decided conversion from a sinful or careless way of life. They are apt to look back to their former state, and around them, at their neighbours, instead of looking forward to their own future progress; and to reverse the conduct of the Apostle, who "counted not himself to have apprehended," and who "forgetting those things that are behind, and reaching forth unto those things that are above, pressed towards the mark," that he might obtain the heavenly prize. Not that they suppose they have henceforth no Christian duties to practise; but that, regarding themselves as God's own

beloved people,* sanctified and sealed to the day of Salvation by Him, they gradually become less anxious for continual *improvement;* forgetting, practically, that every branch of the true vine is required not only to "bear fruit lest it be cast forth as a barren branch, and withered," but also to be continually "purged (pruned) that it may bring forth *more* fruit:" forgetting, that every advance made in Christian knowledge and Christian virtue is a step gained towards a still further advance;—that it is so much interest accumulated on the talent originally committed to us; which must immediately be added to the principal, that it may increase still further by continual usury, till the Lord of the deposit shall Himself call us to render "an account of our stewardship."

And I need not, I am sure, warn you, my Reverend Brethren, that it is, in practice, scarcely possible to stand still;—that they who are not

* Σωζομενοι (Acts ii. 47) rendered "such as should be saved," means persons in the way of salvation: and so also απολλυμενοι (2 Cor. iv. 3,) means "persons at present in the road to destruction," not, the irrecoverably "lost:" otherwise, the words would have been σεσωσμενοι and απολωλοτες.

anxious " daily" (according to the petition in the Confirmation-service) to " *increase* more and more in God's Holy Spirit," are not in a way " to *continue* his for ever," but rather, to " lose their first love."

I am not one of those who seek to guard against that careless spiritual-pride to which I have adverted, by striving to fill the sincere Christian with alarming uncertainty as to his final destiny, so that he should contemplate his acceptance or rejection at the day of Judgment as a fearfully doubtful prospect. Those indeed who are living in an unchristian state, have much need that they should be, if possible, filled with alarm ; but this is in order that they should without delay seek to escape from that state which affords reason for such alarm. To those who have sincerely and heartily enlisted themselves " under Christ's banner," no exhortation is more earnestly urged in Scripture than to " *rejoice* in the Lord always ;" a feeling which seems incompatible with a state of fearful doubt as to the momentous question of eternal bliss or misery.

But if we are careful not to " put asunder

what God" (in his Holy Word) "has joined together,"—viz. confident hope and strenuous exertion,—we shall be in no danger, on the one hand, of driving our hearers, without occasion, into despondency, or into that "fear which hath torment," or, on the other hand, of leading them into indolent and presumptuous security;—of teaching them, either on the one hand, to seek justification through their own virtues, or on the other hand, not to "give *diligence* to make their calling and election sure."

We must teach them, as the Apostle does, to "work out their own salvation, with fear and trembling," on the ground that "it is God who worketh in them both to will and to do of his good pleasure." Nor will this "working," and this "trembling" anxiety be deemed at all inconsistent with the "firmest confidence that He who hath begun a good work in them will perform the same," by those who shall be taught to look to the analogy of earthly transactions; in which the fullest confidence of success in any undertaking, and the resolution to use such exertions as are considered indispensable to that success, are ideas so far from being incompatible, that

they are, in matters of daily occurrence, inseparably united in the mind. "When a man is returning for instance" (as I have observed in Essay IV. of the Second Series) "from his daily labour to his home, he feels a perfect certainty (supposing his life and limbs to be spared) that he shall reach his home: it is an event, of which, practically, he feels no more doubt than of the setting of the sun; but he does not therefore *stand still,* and neglect to use the means, because he is confident of the event; on the contrary, the very ground of his confidence is the full determination he feels to press forward towards his object."

With a view to second your endeavours towards the inculcation of right principles in these and in other points, on the minds of the younger part of your hearers, I suggested, as you may remember, to those who had been confirmed, the commemoration of that occasion, by setting apart the anniversary of it as a kind of private religious festival, in each succeeding year. I think there may often be a great advantage in thus fixing on particular seasons for more especial self-examination and devotion, in order to guard against that spiritual languor and care-

less security which is always apt to creep over us amidst the business and pleasures of the world, and to paralyze our good resolutions. If you approve of what I recommended, you may easily second my advice, by inserting a sentence or two in a sermon, on the Sunday next before the anniversary of the Confirmation; in which you may address those young persons to whom the admonition was directed, and remind them of the occasion. In these and in all other matters pertaining to the great work in which we are fellow-labourers, my earnest wish and prayer is for a cordial cooperation between us; without which, your endeavours are likely to be the less successful, and mine almost entirely unavailing. I have the more hope of attaining this object because I come among you perfectly unconscious at least, of any personal or party-bias,—of any unfriendly prejudice, ecclesiastical or political, that might have led me to undervalue, or to thwart, the useful exertions of my Clergy. And I am bound to acknowledge, with gratitude to Divine Providence, that I find increasing encouragement for this hope;—that the misrepresentations and mistakes which originated

in idle and rash conjecture, or in other causes, seem, for the most part, in a way to be corrected; and that a truer estimate seems to be formed of the intentions of one who is aiming in all sincerity (as far as the human heart can know itself,) at the temporal and eternal welfare of the Ministers and of the Church of Christ. For this object, my Reverend Brethren, let us agree in offering up our prayers to Him who has left a promise to such as shall thus agree;* and for this let us combine our earnest endeavours.

Your affectionate friend,

RICHARD DUBLIN.

* Matt. xviii. 19.

NOTE.

PAGE 68.

I HAVE heard it urged on the opposite side, that to admit candidates below the age—say fifteen—at which it is *likely* they can be well-prepared, is to place an unwarrantable confidence in the discretion of the Clergy. I have only to reply, that such confidence I *must* repose in them at any rate: for I can, generally, have no other warrant than their discretion, for the fitness of *any* candidate at whatever age. It is but too plain that under a negligent pastor the older candidates may be quite unqualified to partake of the rite.

ADDRESS

TO

THE CLERGY OF THE DIOCESES OF DUBLIN AND GLANDELOUGH,

ON THE

CONCLUSION OF THE CONFIRMATION,

1834.

Προσεύξομαι τῷ πνεύματι, προσεύξομαι δὲ καὶ τῷ νοΐ·
1 Cor. xiv. 15.

ADDRESS,

&c. &c.

MY REVEREND BRETHREN,

In addressing you on the occasion of having brought to a close the second Confirmation since my appointment, it is not necessary for me to dwell at large on the topics touched on in my former letter, any further than thus briefly to repeat the expression of my satisfaction at the orderly and decorous arrangements which I found made for the celebration of the Ordinance, and of my thanks for the hospitable kindness with which I was received.

The number of young persons confirmed, amounted in all to 2368; and a great majority of these, (together with a large portion of the rest of each congregation,) were immediate

attendants at the Lord's Table. This circumstance, together with the appearance, generally, of a serious and devout attention to the whole service, warrants a hope that the persons confirmed had also, for the most part, been diligently and judiciously prepared. In a few, and but a few, instances, I found occasion to re-examine some of the younger candidates; and a part of these were, in consequence, recommended to defer their confirmation to a future occasion. And there may, perhaps, have been other similar cases, which I had not the means of ascertaining. But I will take this opportunity of reminding you, with a view to future occasions, that as it is my full intention to continue as I have begun, a *frequent* administration of the Ordinance, there is the more reason for your keeping back from it any candidates whose state of preparation, intellectual or moral, may be—I do not say palpably insufficient, but—doubtful. When Confirmations are held only once in three, four, or five years, or, perhaps, still more unfrequently, there is reason to apprehend that some candidates, about whose state of fitness there may be some doubt, may, if not brought forward when

the opportunity offers, be eventually deprived of the rite altogether. But the case is different when Confirmations are held every year, or every other year. And I am anxious that the full advantage should be taken of this practice, by deferring the confirmation of all those whose state of preparation is not entirely satisfactory.

With respect to the age of the candidates, I decline, for the reasons I formerly gave, to lay down any rule. It would be easy for me to specify an age below which I think it not *probable* that a child should be duly prepared.* But if I were on this to found a rule, admitting of exceptions, to be determined by your discretion, this would be, in fact, equivalent to no rule at all. And if, again, I were to admit of no exceptions, I should manifest a distrust, of those whom I hope indeed I have no reason to distrust, but in whose discretion, at any rate, I should be *obliged* to trust after all. For since mere age is far from insuring suitable preparation—persons of seventeen, and upwards, being often quite unfit for the Ordinance—I can have, in general,

* See Note at the end of former Address, p. 77.

nothing but your conscientious diligence to confide in, in respect of the fitness of any candidates, of whatever age, to whom you may give certificates.

With respect to the mode of instructing and of examining candidates, since you must often find it necessary or expedient to employ the assistance of schoolmasters and mistresses, and of other lay-catechists, some of whom may not have been accustomed to the best mode of procedure, I would suggest to you to warn them especially against an error which is of very frequent occurrence—that of teaching children to repeat by rote words which they do not understand, or which they misunderstand; and being satisfied with a fluent repetition of prepared answers, of which they have not received, or have not comprehended, the explanation. There is no one, I suppose, who would seriously interpret the words of our Rubric respecting a child's being able "to say the Creed, the Lord's Prayer, and the Ten Commandments," &c. as implying that the mere knowledge of the *words*, without the meaning of them, constitutes the instruction intended. But there are many who are disposed

to take for granted, too readily, that a child (or indeed a grown person also) understands clearly what he can recite fluently. That this is not necessarily the case, most of you, I doubt not, are well aware; and I think also, that those of you who have had the most experience in tuition will concur with me in the conviction, which is the result of my own experience, that it is, in the end, the least troublesome, as well as incomparably the most effectual course, to teach children the meaning of what they are learning, *before* they commit the words to memory. By this means they are trained to exercise their understanding, and are guarded against acquiring that most hurtful habit, so difficult to eradicate, of suffering their thoughts to wander while they are repeating or hearing forms of words.

You should recommend, therefore, both by precept and example, the practice of employing the Catechism—in the first instance—as a guide to the *teacher* only, without at once putting it into the hands of the learners. Let these be instructed in the doctrines and duties which the Catechism inculcates—first, out of such portions of *Scripture* as they shall have been reading:

which procedure will carry with it this additional advantage, that it will early implant the habit of practically adhering to that fundamental Protestant principle set forth in our 8th Article, (which Article itself, by the way, it would be easy and desirable to impress on the understanding and memory of a child,) of referring to the Holy Scriptures as the only sufficient authority.

Children also should be trained, in the first instance, to give answers when under examination, in their *own* words, (however puerile and inelegant their phraseology,) and not always in the *same* words. It will be time enough to supply them with the most correct expressions after they shall have fully mastered the matter of what is taught them.

How much the habit of repeating by rote has in many instances paralysed, as it were, the attention, and left the understanding in a dormant state, you may easily judge by questioning some children, and even adults, (by no means wanting in intelligence,) in the Catechism.

For instance, take this passage—"I pray unto God to give me his grace, that I may continue in the same, unto my life's end:" "*continue*

in what?" is a question which you will find will often be met by a wrong answer, or by none at all. Again, the mode of utterance of another passage you will often find such as at once to indicate a misconception of its sense: a Sacrament is defined "an outward and visible sign of an inward and spiritual grace,—given unto us ordained by Christ Himself." A person who utters (as many do) this sentence in the manner here marked, you will generally find (as might have been expected) at a loss to say *what* is "given" and *what* is "ordained."

Yet the sense of these passages is easily explained, and easily remembered, provided a child is not taught to commit them to memory *previously* to the explanation.

According to this plan, though it will sometimes be *apparently* slower and more troublesome at first, I will engage that much time and labour will be saved in the end, and the pupil will not have, as under the opposite system, a great deal to unlearn.

And I need hardly remind you, that the truths designed to be conveyed in the Catechism are to be collected from many of those passages

of Scripture which are level to a child's capacity, even more easily than from the Apostles' Creed. For instance, the doctrine of our redemption by Christ, which is so plainly stated by the sacred writers, can hardly be said to be implied at all in the words of the Apostles' Creed (though it is set forth in the explanation that follows); the historical *fact* alone being recorded, of our Saviour's death, without specifying *for whom* and for what He submitted to it.

The religious knowledge, however, which I have been speaking of is, as you are well aware, though indispensable, yet a part only, and that the least part, though it is the first, of the requisite preparation for the Ordinance of Confirmation. You must ascertain as well as you can—what, after all, we cannot be so fully assured of as of intellectual proficiency—how far each candidate is duly prepared in respect of the most important point,—that pious frame of mind,—that serious and deep-fixed desire of devoting himself to Christ, without which the reception of the Ordinance is no more than an empty mockery. And you will have found, I doubt not, that in some young persons, not

altogether unpromising, this religious seriousness will not develop itself so early, in proportion to their intellectual progress, as in other, even younger, children.

In such cases the postponement of Confirmation is on many accounts to be recommended.

But though, as I have said, no certain knowledge can be obtained, much less any rule laid down that can supersede the exercise of your own careful judgment, this negative rule at least I feel justified in confidently recommending; that no candidate should be admitted to Confirmation who is not ready and desirous to partake of the holy Communion. Of course we cannot insist on their all partaking of this sacrament immediately on being confirmed; because some may be withheld by the scruples of parents or guardians, whom they are bound to obey. But I wish you to ascertain carefully whether in any case the candidate is really kept away from the Lord's Table wholly and solely in obedience to the will of another, being himself desirous to attend, or whether there is a disinclination in his own mind. If you find the latter to be the case, I have no hesitation in saying

that such a candidate ought not to be then presented for confirmation. For, in respect of the requisite *knowledge*, concerning both the sacraments, our Church has, most properly, furnished instruction in the very Catechism expressly designed for the preparation of children for confirmation: so that if the nature of the ordinance of the Lord's Supper be not sufficiently *understood*, it is plain the candidate has not sufficiently learnt what the Church designed him to learn previously to his being confirmed. If again the candidate's objection to communicate proceed not from ignorance, but (which is the only alternative) from some moral deficiency—from a want of devout feeling—of faith in the divine promises—of submissive reverence for the divine commands, in short, from disinclination to devote himself heartily to Christ, according to the engagement made for him at Baptism, then, it is plain he is not yet in a proper frame of mind to come forward solemnly to renew, in the Ordinance of Confirmation, that baptismal engagement.

No one, I think, who carefully reads over the Baptismal Service, can doubt, that a person who

is in a fit state to come forward and profess before God and the Christian congregation that he has in sincerity taken upon himself the engagement *there* made in his name, must be also in a fit state to receive the Lord's Supper. If he is in such a state that it is right for him publicly to declare his resolution, through divine help to "fight manfully under the banner of Christ crucified against sin, the world, and the devil, and to continue Christ's faithful soldier and servant unto his life's end," he cannot surely be an unworthy communicant; nor consequently can be justified in wilfully turning away from the Lord's Table. On the contrary, a *sincere* anxiety to fulfil his baptismal engagement, must make him desirous to avail himself of all the means of grace that are offered. Hence it is that I have said that nothing should withdraw from the Communion a candidate for Confirmation, except either such an intellectual or such a moral unfitness (and this is, as I have said, the only alternative) as should equally withhold him from Confirmation also. And that such was the view taken by the Framers of our Services is so evident, that I have little doubt

they would have appended to the office of Confirmation the celebration of the Communion, had not an early attendance at that Sacrament been, as they supposed, secured, by the obligation laid on *every* one (every one, that is, who either had been "confirmed, or was ready and desirous to be confirmed") to "communicate at least three times in every year." But the letter of this regulation not being enforced, and the spirit of the directions, relative to Confirmation, being too often overlooked, hence it happens that an indefinite and often a very long interval is allowed to elapse between Confirmation and attendance at the Lord's Table. And thus the Ordinance of Confirmation itself is often misapprehended, and, in one way or another, distorted from its proper purpose. It either sinks into almost entire insignificance, or else is superstitiously regarded as a kind of distinct Sacrament, instead of being considered as, what it really is, the connecting link between the one Sacrament and the other. It is properly, the conclusion and completion of the Baptismal Service, and the introduction to the holy Communion. And though too often so mistaken

and perverted as to become an empty and unmeaning form, or a dangerous snare, it has, when rightly used, this benefit among others, that it does away the objections to Infant-baptism, and combines the advantages both of that and of the opposite systems.*

The suggestions I have here thrown out you will, I hope, find favourably received by those lay-assistants whose Christian benevolence may have led them to take a part with you in the important work of the instruction of youth. Should any of them be inclined to consider what has been said on the requisite preparation for Confirmation, as mistimed and inappropriate to the present occasion, inasmuch as the celebration of the Ordinance has been just concluded, and a considerable interval must be expected to elapse before the next Confirmation, this must be, I think, from a misconception of the whole

* This may serve to explain the unexpected vehemence with which an Anabaptist teacher declaimed against the Ordinance, in a town in England in which I was deputed to administer it. The attack excited much wonder in the minds of some persons, though (for the reason above given) none at all in mine.

character of that rite. But this, I trust, you will take care, when it may be needful, to explain. I will not suppose that any of you are infected with the vulgar error of regarding the preparation of children for being confirmed, as a work to be begun and ended within a few weeks previous to the celebration of the Ordinance; and that it consists in qualifying a child to learn the answers to certain questions, in order that he may pass an examination, with a view to obtain a certificate which shall admit him to bear a part in a certain ceremony. Of course sufficient notice will always be given, to enable you to examine those under your spiritual care, and *select* such as are fit to be brought forward. But the *preparation* for Confirmation comprises, if rightly considered, the whole of the religious education of young children. To train them rightly to understand, and duly appreciate, all that has been done for them, and said in their names, at baptism, is to prepare them both to come forward before the Christian congregation, "ratifying and confirming the same in their own persons," and also to "lead

the rest of their life according to this beginning."

But the ceremony of Confirmation, when rightly conducted, is especially serviceable to those engaged in the religious education of youth, as furnishing a kind of fixed point in the Christian's path, by which his progress may be marked; a perceptible and most important stage of advancement; and by furnishing an occasion, from time to time, for effectually re-awakening the attention both of the youthful and of the adult Christian to the state of their spiritual growth.

I have availed myself of this opportunity to call your attention thus earnestly, though briefly, to the subject of Education; not as supposing that it is a neglected part of your duty, but as what I consider to be the most important part of all; and, also, as a part to which we the more need to be stimulated by the inculcation of purely conscientious motives, through the absence of those secondary human incentives which, in other departments of duty, may be called into play: to whose influence—contemptible as they may be in reality—few can

justly boast of being wholly insensible; and of which it is difficult for any one to be certain in what degree they may operate on himself. An eloquent Preacher, or a powerful theological Writer, may obtain celebrity and popular influence; and though every one would admit that we ought to be influenced by a far higher motive than the hope of these, most would also admit that such a hope does operate as a stimulus, at least on many persons, in a greater degree than probably they themselves are aware. But the assiduous and skilful Catechist has seldom, as such, either fame or power, or any worldly advantage to look for. His eloquence—as it may fitly be called, in the highest sense of the term—gains him no glory; elicits from his young pupils no rapturous applause; but only that most substantial approbation shown in their learning what he teaches, and becoming such as he would have them. And yet his services are of the very highest order. For children constitute not only the whole of the next generation of adults—"the morrow of society"—but are also, as I need hardly remind you, in the state in which impressions of all kinds are the most

easily made, and, in general, the most durably fixed. It has always, therefore, been a favourite maxim with me to "take care of the children, and the grown people will take care of themselves."

I would not, indeed, be understood to speak disparagingly of the other ministerial duties. But I am convinced, that the ablest preacher will, generally, produce a greater or a less benefit to his hearers, in proportion as they have been better or worse trained as children. And though he should neither relax his endeavours nor despair of their success, in impressing evangelical truth on the hearts of some even of those who have been neglected in childhood, he can hardly hope to bring most of them to a level with such as are even left much worse provided with ministerial instruction in after life, but have been so educated, in understanding and in disposition, as to be put in the way of becoming their own instructors.

May our joint endeavours in this great work be invigorated, and guided, and prospered by Him "from whom cometh every good and

perfect gift;" who has appointed some of us "to plant, and some to water, but who Himself giveth the increase!"

Your affectionate friend,

RICHARD DUBLIN.

ADDRESS

TO

THE INHABITANTS OF DUBLIN AND ITS VICINITY,

RESPECTING THE

OBSERVANCE OF THE LORD'S DAY.

Τῇ μιᾷ τῶν σαββάτων, συνηγμένων τῶν μαθητῶν.

Acts xx. 7.

ADDRESS,

&c. &c.

MY CHRISTIAN FRIENDS,

I WISH to address a few words to you, respecting the prevailing neglect and profanation of the Lord's Day. I have been consulted on the subject, both by my own Clergy,* and by a deputation from the Presbyterian congregation in this city. I have promised them to use my endeavours in the ensuing session of Parliament, for the adoption of any legislative measures that may appear well calculated to check the Sunday-traffic, and Sunday-intemperance, which are now so common; and I have given my hearty approbation to their proposal, of addressing their respective congregations from the pulpit, expressly on this subject.

* See page 120.

But as it unfortunately happens, that from the very nature of the case, a large proportion of those who most need to be admonished on this point, will not be present to hear the exhortations intended for them, I have determined to address you in this form, in the hope that this paper may fall into the hands of some who shall have been absent from the regular Sunday instruction, and that, through the Divine help, it may not prove wholly unavailing.

Those who are members of the same Church of which I am a minister, I call upon to bestow their attention on these few words, by their regard for our fellowship in that Church. Those again who are of a different Communion, but profess themselves disciples of the same Saviour, I entreat to listen to me for the sake of Him who, as on this day, "rose from the dead, for our justification."—I do not intend to enter on the discussion of any points in which Christians conscientiously differ from each other, but to confine myself as much as possible to those in which all Christians, who are such in any thing but in name, must agree, at least in their *judgment*, as to what is right, however wide that

may be from their *practice*. Much as Christians have differed from each other in several of their doctrines,—in their mode of religious worship, —and in the various holidays observed by each, all Christians, from the very earliest times, have agreed in dedicating to the Lord, in some way, the first day of the week; and a little calm reflection would bring them all, I think, to agree, at least to a certain extent, as to the manner in which a day set apart for religious purposes ought to be observed.

All must surely acknowledge, that to employ it in the ordinary business of the other days of the week, must destroy its character as a day *set apart* from others, and leave it undistinguished from the rest. And if it is distinguished from other days, by setting it apart as a day of intemperate riot, or frivolous dissipation, any one who seriously considers the subject must perceive that this is quite opposite to the character of a day consecrated to *religious* purposes. It is to turn a *Holy* day into an *unholy* day. As for those who fix on this day for assembling for the purposes of brutal outrage and violence, it is hardly possible to conceive a more deliberate insult to

Him, who, as on this day, rose from the dead, and was "manifested that He might destroy the works of the devil," than the choosing of that day for thus openly enlisting in the service of his great Enemy.

Some persons, I find, have busily circulated a slanderous report, that I am myself unfavourable to the religious observance of Sunday: and since it is likely, that for one person who has read what I have written, or heard what I have preached, on this, and other points, there may be twenty who have heard in conversation pretended accounts of my opinions, there is a danger that those who are so credulous as to believe, without examination, whatever is confidently asserted, may have given credit to this calumny.* And some may even have helped to circulate it, without actually knowing that they were propagating a falsehood. These are by no

* I allude to the misrepresentations which have been circulated respecting a note appended to one of my Essays, and afterwards printed separately, under the title of "Thoughts on the Sabbath." To that I refer the reader for a full proof, if not of the soundness of my own views, at least of the utter falsity of the imputations which have too often been cast upon me.

means free from blame; since no one ought to circulate an injurious report which he does not know to be true. "Every idle word," says our Lord, "that men say, they shall give an account thereof at the day of judgment." But far deeper guilt certainly is theirs who first fabricated this calumny; and thus have done all that lay in them to throw whatever weight my opinions may be supposed to carry, on the side of those who neglect and contemn religious observances. The two great Commandments in which our Lord sums up Christian duty are, to "love the Lord our God with all our heart," and to "love one's neighbour as one's self:" and it is hardly possible to violate both of these, in one act, more effectually, than by promoting the dishonour of God through the means of a slander of one's neighbour.

But still, when those who are in their own opinions adverse to religious observances, labour to represent me as agreeing with them, their doing so, is, though utterly unjustifiable, at least intelligible and consistent. Their falsehood may serve to promote their own object. But it is strange as well as shocking, that some who profess themselves at least, zealous advocates for

the observance of the Lord's Day, should labour to represent me, falsely, as opposed to it; and thus seek to cast the weight of my authority, be it much or little, into the opposite scale. It is a folly as well as a sin, if they have any real zeal for God's honour, to let their controversial virulence hurry them into propagating a falsehood which tends to defeat their own object.

I would not have said so much of myself, if it were merely my own personal concern, not connected in any way with the cause of religion. As far as our own character is concerned, we ought not to repine at being assailed by slander. Our blessed Master was Himself exposed to its unsparing assaults from his great enemy, whose title in Scripture signifies "The Defamer." The Son of God, who "went about doing good," was accused of being an agent of the prince of demons; and He warned his followers to be prepared for like attacks.—"If they have called the Master of the House, Beelzebub, how much more, them of his household?"

I do not allow myself, therefore, to be uneasy, on my own account, at any accusations brought against me; taking care only that, through God's

help, they shall still want (as they have hitherto) that one important ingredient, truth; without which they will do me no lasting harm. May God forgive the authors of them, and bring them to a better mind! But I am anxious that *you* should not be misled by false representations, as to any matter in which God's glory, and your duty and happiness are concerned.

I am anxious, in common with, I believe, all persons, of whatever church, "who love our Lord Jesus Christ in sincerity," that his Resurrection-day should be, not indeed the *only* day in each week in which Christians should think of, and serve Him, but a day more particularly set apart for religious worship, and religious study and meditation. And if the day ought to be thus dedicated to such purposes, it is plain we ought to abstain from any thing that may interfere with its being so observed, both by ourselves and by those we employ.

Thus far at least, all sincere Christians must, I think, in their deliberate judgment agree, however they may differ in some other points. And Christians, in almost all ages, have so far concurred with the Jews, as to set apart one day of

religious observance in each week; corresponding, so far, with the Jewish Sabbath; though ours is celebrated at a different *time*, and, in some respects, in a different *manner*, and in commemoration of a different *event*. The Jewish Sabbath, we know begins at the evening-twilight of Friday, and ends at the twilight of Saturday evening. Our Sunday is reckoned from midnight on Saturday, to the next midnight. There were observances again, relative to the Jewish Sabbath, which no Church has extended to the Lord's Day. In particular, they were expressly forbidden to kindle a fire on the Sabbath—(Exod. xxxv. 3.) And on the other hand, assembling for the purpose of religious worship, which all Christian Churches have always enjoined as an essential part of the celebration of the Lord's Day, was only a custom,—certainly a very right and suitable custom,—among the Jews, on the Sabbath, (at least in later times, when Synagogues were built) but formed no part of the injunctions of the fourth Commandment. And again, the Jewish observance was appointed expressly to commemorate God's resting from the work of Creation on the

seventh day; while the Lord's Day is celebrated, and has its name, in honour of our Lord's resurrection on the *first* day of the week; and partly also (according to some of the earliest Christian writers) in commemoration of the first day of Creation, in which, God created *Light* in the natural world corresponding to the resurrection and manifestation of Jesus, "the true light, which lighteth every man that cometh into the world"—(John i.)

"As to the celebration of Christian festivals" (says Wheatly, on the Common Prayer, ch. 5. § 2.) "the early Christians thought themselves as much bound to celebrate them, as the Jews were to observe theirs. They had received greater benefits, and therefore, it would have been the highest degree of ingratitude to have been less zealous in commemorating them." Many questions have been raised among Christians as to what degree of conformity is due to the Mosaic law—or, to the example of the Apostles and other early Christians—or, to the authority and institutions of each Church. But when these, or any other points, are discussed on which Christians *differ* from each other, it is

important that they should never suffer themselves (as is too often the case) to lose sight of the points wherein they *agree*. And when different persons come to the same conclusion for different reasons, though it is allowable, charitably and fairly to debate the question—Who has the best reason for what he thinks or does? —we should beware of charging our neighbour with not believing what he professes, merely because he does not believe it on the same grounds with ourselves. When the woman of Samaria testified of our Lord as the Christ, because He had told her the principal events of her private life, many of the Samaritans, we are told, believed in Him, on the saying of the woman—(John iv.)—but many more doubted, till they were convinced by his preaching; "and said unto the woman, Now we believe, not because of thy saying, for we have heard Him ourselves, and know that this is indeed the Christ." Now it is not unlikely that these two parties may have been tempted to blame each other; the one, for foolish credulity, in believing on the woman's testimony, before they had heard Jesus; the other, for want of

faith, in not being at once satisfied with that testimony. But if each party had gone on to accuse the other of being, for this reason, no true believers in Jesus, nor worthy to be received into the fellowship of his disciples, both parties would have lost Him, as long as they manifested such an unchristian spirit.

I wish, then, on the present occasion, to waive all matters of controversy, and to address all Christians who agree in acknowledging the Lord's Day as consecrated to Him; and I entreat all such, to observe it, and endeavour to induce and assist their neighbours to observe it, in such a manner as shall tend to the glory of Him whose Day it is, and to the benefit of men's immortal souls. I am happy to learn from several of my Clergy, that the neglect and profanation of this Day is much less observable in this City, at present, than a few years ago. But the attention to its duties, though greater than it *was*, is still much less than it *ought* to be: and I exhort you, therefore, my Christian friends, not to compare yourselves with those of the last generation, or with what you yourselves may have been formerly; but with the

standard of Christian perfection. In this, as well as in any other Christian duty, improvement is a good sign, only when it is a *promising* sign: if it encourage us to go on to still further improvement, it is a great benefit; if it tempt us contentedly to stand still, it is a snare to us.

Do not "forsake the assembling of yourselves together" for divine worship, on the plea that you can say your prayers at home. So you may indeed; and so you ought: but Christ has given an especial promise of favour to a *Congregation* of Christians. "Wheresoever two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst of them." And if you are one of those whose time is at their own disposal, make not this a plea for disregarding public religious instruction on Sundays, on the ground that you may follow your religious studies at *any* time. It is indeed a great advantage to you to be able to do so; but a business which has *no particular* season set apart for it, is in danger of being omitted altogether. What may be done at any time, is apt to be done at no time. And were it otherwise, you are bound, not only to feel an inward regard for religion,

but, for the sake of your brethren, to testify it publicly, and show that you are "not ashamed of your Master and his words."

But, if you are of the number of those who are engaged in business, or in labour, for your maintenance, do not lose the precious opportunity of drawing off your thoughts from those for one day in the week, and using the leisure of that day for improving in the knowledge of Him with whom you hope to live in endless happiness after death. If you find it irksome to turn away your mind from the cares and the pleasures of this world, for *one* day in the week, how will you bear to bid farewell to them *for ever?*—or how could you endure to dwell through all eternity in the company of Christ and his Saints, even if you were brought there? Your great business in this world, is, not indeed to earn heavenly happiness by your own merits, but to become capable of it, and prepare yourselves to enjoy it; and it would be no happiness to one whose "heart and treasure are on Earth."

If the Lord required of men to sacrifice a small part of their weekly gains for the sake of

worshipping Him, and studying what He has taught, there is no one that cares for his favour who would not joyfully make that sacrifice. But there are some unhappily, who care, and think little or nothing about Him. And it is on *their* account chiefly that I mention the circumstance, that in reality, there is little or no sacrifice required. Even a man who has no religion at all ought not to regard it as a hardship, that he should be required, in common with his neighbours, to abstain from his ordinary business one day in the week; but should rather regard it as an advantage to be able to purchase a day of leisure so cheaply. If, indeed, one man keeps his shop shut, while others have theirs open, he suffers a loss. But if *all* follow the same rule, no one is a loser. There would not be, for instance, more bread, or more cloth, bought in the course of the week, if all bakers and clothiers kept their shops open all the week, than there is now. The only difference would be, that they would have the trouble of attending to their shops seven days instead of six. And so also, if all labourers were to work on Sundays, they would find their *week's* wages

would be the same as now. For it would be the same thing as increasing the number of labourers in the Country by one seventh; which would of course cause the labourer's *daily* wages to be lowered. And for this reason it is that there is no hardship in the laws which enjoin shutting up of shops on Sunday. As long as the rule is the same for all, hardly any shops are losers by it; except, perhaps, the spirit-shops; and what is spent there is generally a greater evil than good to the Public.

So far, therefore, is it from being any hardship, to prevent by law the opening of shops on Sundays, that there *would* be a hardship in the want of such a law. For if all who chose it were allowed to carry on their trade every day, such as had no regard for religion would have an unfair advantage over the rest. And it certainly would be unjust, that a tradesman who scrupled on religious grounds to profane the Lord's day, should for that reason be made a loser, and should not be put on an equal footing with his neighbours.

This is too often the case as it is, in violation of the law; and therefore it is, that I exhort

you, my Christian friends, to lend your support to such as observe this law, and discountenance all violations of it. No human law indeed, can, or should attempt to *force* men *to be religious;* but it is only fair that the laws should prevent any hinderance being thrown in the way of those who are disposed to practise the duties of their religion. For such a law cannot do violence to any man's conscience. Whatever any one's religious or irreligious notions may be, he cannot think himself bound in conscience to labour on the Lord's day. And every one is bound in conscience to obey and support the laws of the land, when they do not enjoin any thing *contrary* to his religious duty. "Submit yourselves," (says the Apostle) "to every ordinance of man, for *the Lord's sake.*"

And remember, therefore, that you are much to blame, if you encourage others to violate either human or divine laws, which you acknowledge that you yourself are bound to obey. If, for instance, after devoutly attending divine worship with your family, you just turn into a shop to buy some trifling article, you indeed may not feel that you are doing any thing that

interferes with your own devout observance of the day; but you should remember that the expectation of some such chance-customers may induce the tradesman to remain *all day* in his shop, occupied in his ordinary worldly affairs, and deprived of his best, and perhaps only opportunity, of attending to the concerns of his soul. And yet you will have been, just before, praying to God "not to lead you into temptation," when you thus lead your brother into temptation.

As for the particular mode of employing the Lord's day, that is most befitting a Christian, it would be scarcely possible to lay down in detail any set of precise rules, such as would be equally suitable for all descriptions of people; and were it otherwise, the strictest observance of such rules would go but a little way towards the proper sanctification of the day by each individual, unless he did all that he judged right to be done, heartily and cheerfully, "not grudgingly or of necessity;" "for God loveth a cheerful" worshipper, as well as "a cheerful giver," and has taught us that we should "serve the Lord with gladness."

I will rather exhort you, therefore, my Christian friends, to fill your heart every Lord's day with the thought of the great and glorious occasion of it—the resurrection of your Master from the grave; with gratitude and love towards Him, "who suffered for our sins, and rose again for our justification;"—with the thoughts of your own resurrection, when He "will raise those up at the last day" who shall have truly loved and obeyed Him in this world;—and of that great Lord's day, (which shall never have an end) which his faithful servants will then begin. Fill your heart with such thoughts as these, and act so as to testify to all around you that these *are* your sentiments, and that you are not ashamed to avow them.

And lastly, remember to make the first day of the week a *preparation* for the rest. Do not lay aside all thoughts of religion, as soon as the Sunday comes to an end; reckoning that you have had enough of the whole business for one week, and may fairly set your whole heart on the concerns of the world for the remainder. It cannot satisfy a sincere Christian to serve God *only* one day in seven, and to serve

Mammon the other six. But endeavour to apply to the practice of your daily life all that you shall on that day have learned of your religion, and to fulfil the good resolutions you shall have formed. Endeavour in short to become, and to show yourself to all around you, the *better Christian all the week, in consequence* of your employment of Sunday. And may it please God so to bless this sacred day to us, that each succeeding week may find us better Christians than the last;—not only so much the nearer (as we must be) to the grave, but so much advanced in our preparation for a better life beyond it.

PALACE,
December 30th, 1832.

THE ADDRESS

OF THE

CLERGY OF DUBLIN, TO HIS GRACE THE ARCHBISHOP, AGREED UPON THIS DAY, DECEMBER 11TH, AT A MEETING CONVENED BY THE ARCHDEACON OF THE DIOCESE.

We, the Clergy of Dublin, beg leave to assure your Grace, that the intercourse which you have encouraged us to hold with you, since your appointment to this Diocese, has given us the most perfect confidence in your anxiety to assist us, individually and collectively, in the performance of our sacred duties. We are conscious it is incumbent on us, as Ministers of the Established Church, to consult our Diocesan in every important matter which concerns the interests of religion; and we feel that, in complying with this duty at present, we are exercising a privilege which we deeply value.

We are persuaded that your Grace will readily believe, that we have endeavoured, in our addresses to our congregations, and in all our private intercourse with our flocks, to impress upon their minds the sacred obligation

of dedicating the Lord's Day to His worship and service. We trust that our efforts have not been unaccompanied by the Divine blessing. We can state, with thankfulness, that an increased sense of the importance of this obligation is manifested by a fuller attendance at Divine worship, and a more frequent commemoration of our blessed Saviour's death. We feel, however, that much improvement remains to be effected, even amongst that portion of society to which we have an opportunity of addressing instruction. We have still to bewail that many seem to regard a mere attendance upon public worship on Sunday as a sufficient performance of the duties of that day; while they devote the remaining portion of it to such amusements as are, to say the least, inconsistent with sobriety of mind. It has occurred to us that a more just impression may be produced on their minds by our setting apart, under the sanction of your Grace, some one Sunday on which every pulpit shall enforce the obligation, simultaneously, and call upon all those who profess the faith of Christ to walk more circumspectly, and to dedicate with greater earnestness to the service of our Lord, that day on which He arose from the dead, and brought life and immortality to light.

But there are vast numbers in this city who exclude themselves from the advantages which might arise to them from the public instructions of the ministry. Upon this portion of society it is almost impossible for the Clergy to produce impression. They keep themselves apart from all religious influences. With regard to

them we feel it has become necessary that measures of a different kind should be adopted. In conjunction with the magistrates, we have sought to restrain the traffic by which Sunday is dishonoured in various parts of this city; but the magistrates, even accompanied by the ensigns of authority and by attendants to enforce compliance with the laws, have been disregarded and personally insulted. The traffic has still continued, to the evident detriment of these more conscientious traders who comply with the obligations of religion, and show respect to the laws of the country. In every part of the city houses of public entertainment are kept open despite of the constituted authorities—and it is observed by all, that more vice is exhibited on Sunday than on any day of the week. Drunkenness and blasphemy are substituted for the observances of religion; the old become hardened in profligacy and contempt of the laws, and the young are drawn away and seduced to their own destruction by an accumulation of pernicious influences. We cannot counteract those lamentable consequences which arise to the young even by a more general establishment of Sunday Schools; we feel, therefore, that our anxiety for the welfare of the rising generation, not only justifies but imperatively demands from us an application to the Legislature through your Grace, praying that they would take this state of things under their serious consideration.

We understand that a bill has passed, or is likely to pass, containing new enactments for enforcing a more strict observance of Sunday in England. We regret

that Ireland has not been included in the bill: and we think it right to solicit parliament, that it may be so included, as far as the provisions of that bill are applicable to the circumstances of this country.

We consider it favourable to the accomplishment of our object, that we shall have the advantage of your Grace's presence in the next session of parliament; and to your Grace's judgment we cheerfully submit a cause in which every minister of religion, and every well-wisher of society, must feel deeply interested.

REPLIES

TO

THE DEAN AND CHAPTER AND TO THE CLERGY OF THE DIOCESE OF DUBLIN,

RELATIVE TO THE SYSTEM OF

NATIONAL EDUCATION IN IRELAND.

Πάντα πᾶσιν ἀρέσκω, μὴ ζητῶν τὸ ἐμαυτοῦ συμφέρον, ἀλλὰ τὸ τῶν πολλῶν, ἵνα σωθῶσι.

1 Cor. x. 33.

PREFATORY NOTICE.

It will be readily understood that these documents, which first appeared about four years ago, are not calculated to convey a notion of the *present* condition of the National-School-system. But I thought it might be interesting to many persons to contrast its apparently unpromising beginnings, amidst so much disheartening opposition and censure, with its subsequent success, in a short space of time, during which the most important parts of the machinery have not even begun to be adequately brought into play. In particular, want of local accommodations has hitherto so much contracted our operations in that most important department, the Model-school for the training of masters, that not one-fifth of the children, desirous of attending it, could be admitted; nor one-twentieth of the masters whom it will be requisite to instruct. The buildings necessary for this purpose are now in a course of completion on a suitable scale.

Nevertheless, the success of the system under all disadvantages, has been such as to secure for it the support of *every successive Administration*. And, indeed, it

is a circumstance well worthy of remark,—highly encouraging—and likely to do away entirely, (as it has already to a great degree) all unfavourable prejudices, that three political parties, differing from each other, most especially *on points relating to Ireland*, should have all *concurred in the one point* of giving their sanction and aid to this system.

In the Report for the year ending 31st March, 1835, it appears that these were then 1,106 schools in operation, attended by 145,521 children: and that of the signatures to the applications made to the Board for aid, 320 were those of Protestant clergymen; 1,397 of Roman Catholic clergymen; 6,915 of Protestant laymen; and 8,630 of Roman Catholic laymen. Now it is remarkable, that according to the late census taken by the Commissioners of Public Instruction, the total number of Protestants in Ireland appears to be rather more than a million and a half, and of Roman Catholics rather less than six millions and a half: so that it will be seen that the Protestant clerical signatures, bore to the Roman Catholic clerical signatures about the same proportion as the number of Protestants to that of Roman Catholics in the mass of the population; and the Protestant lay-signatures, a much higher proportion. It is also observable, that of the signatures to applications from the Province of Ulster, 246 were those of Protestant clergymen; and it is in Ulster that Protestants of that class of life, for which the National Schools are intended, are principally to be found. All this affords a presumption that the system has proved generally beneficial and

acceptable to Protestants and Roman Catholics, according to their respective wants.

Considerable progress has been made during the ten months that have elapsed since the above Report was given in. It appears that the number of schools now in operation is upwards of fourteen hundred: so that it may be calculated that not much fewer than *two hundred thousand children* are at present receiving instruction under the national system. Yet even this number is far short (since fresh applications are continually coming in) of what may ultimately be expected.

When I reflect on the many thousands of my countrymen, who will thus have been made partakers of the blessing of education, and not only enabled in after-life to read the Scriptures, but, most of them, introduced to the study of the sacred Books,—considering also that of these thousands a large proportion would otherwise, in all likelihood, (whether through their own fault, or misfortune) have lived and died in gross and degrading ignorance,—I cannot but most thankfully feel that the anxious and harassing toil and care which have been bestowed on this great object are amply rewarded; and that all the obloquy and vexatious opposition, whether from the perverse, or from the misinformed, with which we were, for a time, assailed, are nothing in comparison of what a Christian minister should be prepared to encounter cheerfully in such a cause.

I annex a List of Books, &c. prepared for the use of the Irish National Schools, under the Direction of the Commissioners:—

	Price to National Schools.		Price to the Public.	
	s.	*d.*	*s.*	*d.*
First Book of Lessons, 18mo.	0	1	0	2½
Second do. 18mo.	0	3	0	8
Third do. 12mo.	0	6	1	4
Third do. Accented for Teachers	0	7½	1	8
Fourth do. 12mo.	0	7½	1	8
Fifth do. 12mo.	0	9	2	0
Scripture Lessons,* Old Testament, No. I. 12mo.	0	4½	1	0
——— No. II. 12mo. in the press	0	4½	1	0
——— New Testament, No. I. 12mo.	0	4½	1	0
——— No. II. 12mo.	0	4½	1	0
Sacred Poetry, 18mo.	0	3	0	8
Arithmetic, 12mo.	0	7	1	6
Key to do. 12mo.	0	7	1	6
Book-keeping, 12mo.	0	4½	1	0
Key to do. 12mo.	0	4½	1	0
Elements of Geometry, 12mo.	0	4	0	10
Mensuration, Gauging, and Land Surveying, &c. 12mo.	1	0	2	6
Simple Directions for Needle Work and Cutting Out, with Specimens of the Work, 8vo, half-bound	4	6	12	0
A Large Edition, 4to, with Specimens	5	3	14	0
Tablet Lessons—Arithmetic, 60 sheets	1	0	2	6
———Spelling and Reading, 33 sheets	0	6	1	3
Copy Lines, all the Gradations, 5 sheets	0	6	1	3
Maps of Europe, Asia, England, Scotland, and Ireland, mounted on canvas and roller, each	6	0	16	0
Class Rolls	0	0	0	2
Instructions for filling do.	0	0	0	2

In Preparation.

Maps of the World, Africa, and America.

An Arithmetic for Young Children—A Geography—and an English Grammar.

* Copies of Scripture Lessons disposed of, 74,111.

The " Scripture Lessons " already published (besides the Book of Exodus, which is in the press) comprise the Book of Genesis, the Gospel of Luke, and the Acts of the Apostles, illustrated by copious appropriate selections from other books of Scripture. The few passages omitted, are merely such as no one would think suitable for the perusal of a child. Of the fidelity of the versions, my readers may judge for themselves, by inspection of the books. They will, I think, be particularly struck with two circumstances: 1st, That those few places in which there is a departure from the words of the authorized Translation of the Bible, such as at all to affect the sense, are those in which *that and the Douay Translation agree;* so that the departure is from both alike: 2dly, That the few objections which have been raised against the fidelity of our versions will be seen to have been either the most frivolous cavils, or else gross fabrications. I mention this, not for the sake of recalling to notice objections now nearly forgotten, or of reproaching the authors of them; but of pointing out how certain it is that, in the long run, a steady adherence to what is right, will not only overcome all the assaults of an adversary, but even convert them into the most decisive testimony. Friends may firmly *believe*, but a zealous and diligent opponent can the most convincingly *prove*, that no valid objection can be raised.

I will conclude this notice, by reprinting in this place the Preface to the First Number of " Scripture Lessons."

" These Lessons, as the name imports, are drawn " from the Sacred Volume, and are almost entirely in

" the language of Scripture, translated literally from the " original. When passages are introduced, not in the " Scripture language, (chiefly summaries of some portion " of the narrative,) they are enclosed between brackets, " and usually distinguished by being printed in a smaller " type.

" The selections are offered, not as a substitute for " the Sacred Volume, but as an introduction to it; " and they have been compiled in the hope of their " leading to a more general and more profitable perusal " of the word of God. The passages introduced have " been chosen, not as being of more importance than the " rest of Scripture, but merely as appearing to be most " level to the understanding of children and youth at " school, and also as being the best fitted to be read " under the direction of teachers not necessarily quali- " fied, and certainly not recognised as teachers of reli- " gion. No passage has either been introduced or " omitted under the influence of any peculiar view of " Christianity, doctrinal or practical.

" The plan pursued in this compilation has been to " take the historical narrative of Scripture as the " foundation, and to attach to it other portions of Scrip- " ture relating to the narrative, either from the Old or " New Testament. Thus, after the narrative of the " Creation, extracts from the Book of Psalms, referring " to the Creation, have been introduced; and after the " narrative of the Deluge, there have been introduced " those comments on that event which are to be found " in the New Testament. This method seems to be

" calculated at once to teach the use of the Sacred His-
" tory, and to fix much of moral and religious instruction
" on the heart, by associating it with a recital of most
" interesting facts. The translation has been made by a
" comparison of the authorized and Douay versions with
" the original.—The language sometimes of the one,
" and sometimes of the other, has been adopted, and
" occasionally deviations have been made from both.
" On this point, the translator feels that he would
" require more indulgence than is likely to be granted
" to him; but he was compelled by the exigency of the
" case, to undertake the task. He has done his best
" to execute it with fidelity, and he has been constantly
" under the eye of those perfectly competent to correct
" any errors into which he might inadvertently fall.
" This he avers, that he has not been influenced, in his
" rendering of any passage, by reference to any peculiar
" religious views. A few notes, chiefly explanatory and
" practical, have been added.

" The present volume is one of a series, which it is
" proposed shall be compiled on similar principles: it
" brings down the history to the settlement, for a time,
" of the Israelites in Egypt, and the death of Joseph.
" The next number, it is intended, shall be drawn from
" the New Testament.

" The Board of Commissioners of Education earnestly
" and unanimously recommended these Lessons to be used
" in all Schools receiving aid from them. They would
" rather trust to a simple recommendation than adopt
" any rule for their use, even bordering upon compulsion,

" persuaded that, if the book be not received willingly, " no compulsion will secure a cordial and beneficial use " of it—and confident, that an appeal to the good sense " and good feeling of the teachers and conductors of " Schools, by a Board that honestly desires to promote " their well-being, and to be on the most friendly and " affectionate terms with them, will be of more avail than " the most rigid enactments.

" The Commissioners offer these extracts from Scrip- " ture to the careful attention of teachers and children, " not only as truth, but as truth recorded under the " influence of inspiration, and truth, with which it is of " the utmost importance for them to be well acquainted; " and to the religious instructors of the children they " cheerfully leave in communicating that instruction, the " use of the Sacred Volume itself, as containing those " doctrines and precepts, a knowledge of which must lie " at the foundation of all true religion.

" The Law of the Lord is unspotted, converting " souls—the testimony of the Lord is faithful, giving " wisdom to little ones."

The reader who wishes for further information respecting the National System, is referred to the " System of Irish Education explained and defended," by the Rev. James Carlile; and " Thoughts on the mixed Character of Government Institutions in Ireland, with particular Reference to the New System of Education. By a Protestant."

REPLY

TO THE

MEMORIAL OF THE DEAN AND CHAPTER.*

DEAR MR. DEAN,

THOUGH in my conversation to you, I entered fully into the subject of the memorial you presented, I feel bound to give a written reply to it, both as a mark of respect to the framers of it, and because I could not expect you to detail all that passed between us.

I shall myself, indeed, be limited to a brief sketch of the substance of it: but if there is any point on which I do not make myself clearly understood, I shall be happy to give a further explanation to any Member of the Chapter.

* See Memorial, p. 199.

I will beg you, in the first place, to assure them that I am always glad to be apprised of the sentiments of my Clergy, on any point connected with the interests of our Establishment, and of true Religion. And if at any time they shall deem it advisable that we should consult together previously to their making up their minds on any question that may arise, they will always find me open to conviction—ready to state, simply and frankly, what occurs to my own mind,—prepared to adopt any reasonable suggestions of another,—and anxious to avail myself of the experience in Irish affairs which many of them must possess.

I think we ought not only to labour, all of us, in the *same* holy cause, but, as far as may be, to *combine* our efforts, and act in concert, like a well-disciplined and organized army. I am far from wishing to exercise any kind of domineering papal authority; or, again, from supplicating admission to the counsels of any who would rather stand aloof from me. But I do think that, in these times especially, we shall best promote, what I trust is our common object, by joint consultation, and (as far as it is

attainable) hearty cooperation. And should a difference of opinion on some points still remain, it shall not be my fault if any hostile dissension is the result.

You may assure the Chapter that I will never give my sanction to "any measures either for the suppression of any portion of the word of God," or for conceding to the Roman Catholic Priests any right or authority not possessed by them at present.

But on many points connected with the experiment about to be tried by his Majesty's Government, great and mischievous misapprehensions seem to prevail. In particular, (to omit for the present matters of detail,) the whole character and original design of the measure appears to be misunderstood. It was not, I apprehend, the intention of Government to frame (much less, to enforce) a system of education that should be *complete*, and should be the best adapted to instruct children in *all* that it is desirable for them to learn; but to provide, as a *national* measure, some degree of national instruction; leaving, as it were, blank pages, to be filled up by *us* in other ways.

It is the office of a *Church*, as such, to instruct in its own religious principles, persons of all ages; and children not the least. The duty of catechizing as well as preaching, is fully recognised in our own Church. And we possess *endowments*, held, I apprehend, under the equitable condition of our labouring for these objects.

Whether those endowments are sufficiently ample, and whether the present state of the public finances will admit of an appropriation of any part of the national revenue in aid of them, are questions I do not undertake to decide. But it will surely be admitted, that it is the duty of the Pastors of our Church, not only to devote their personal labour to the religious instruction both of children and adults, but also, as far as their benefices will allow, to contribute, and to call on their lay brethren to contribute, towards the expenses of books, catechists, &c. for these purposes. I have always myself acted on this principle. My own Living in Suffolk was but poor; but besides superintending, by myself and my Curates, the National School established there, I procured a school-house to be

built for it, chiefly at the cost of Clergymen; by whom also, a very large proportion of its annual expenses has been defrayed. Besides which, an Adult School was established and carried on, and lately, an Infant School instituted; both at my sole cost.

I mention these circumstances not as any matter of boast for myself and the other Clergy in that neighbourhood; much less, as implying that the conduct of the Clergy here is different: on the contrary, I think, and I doubt not the most respectable Irish ministers think with me, that, in all this, we are only fulfilling a plain duty, and employing the Church revenues aright.

A provision then (whether adequate or scanty) for *this* object, being *already* in existence, Government, I conceive, contemplated, beyond this, another, and strictly *national* object. Finding a great part of the Irish poor to be in a state of almost barbarian ignorance, while others of them obtain some small rudiments of education mixed up with lessons of faction and turbulence, and that squalid poverty, ferocity, and insubordination are the results,

they judged it, I conceive, desirable, and possible, to improve, in some degree, their condition,—to advance them in *civilization*, and to make them more *orderly subjects*, by imparting to them such rudiments of education as they could be brought to receive.

To this purpose it was resolved to appropriate a sum of money, not raised from the revenues of the Church,—or from the voluntary contributions of individuals towards some other object,—but, out of the *national* revenue, raised by the taxation (we should remember) of all denominations of the King's subjects.

In disposing of this grant with a view to the proposed object, two, and, I think, *only two*, modes could present themselves, viz.

1st, To divide the money among the different churches and sects; leaving each to educate, from first to last, the children under their care, as they might think best:

2dly, To combine those of different persuasions, in affording, where that might appear desirable, joint instruction in those parts of learning where religious differences do not preclude it; leaving the deficiencies to be filled

up by those able and willing to labour in conveying religious knowledge.

The latter plan was preferred in the first instance; partly, I suppose, because the funds might, in this way, be expected to go further; and likewise, because one part of the very object proposed is, the softening down of mutual animosity, and the cultivation of friendly feelings among the children of neighbours, by accustoming them to associate in the same school.

I am not sanguine as to the success of the measure; but if the present plan should fail, and especially should it fail through *our* opposition to it, it seems highly probable that the *other* plan may be tried;—that *separate portions* of the grant may be placed at the disposal of different denominations of Christians, proportioned to the *numbers*, and to the *poverty* of each class.

Now if this should be done, and if, accordingly, a sum of (say) from 5000*l.* to 10,000*l.* per annum were bestowed on Protestants, and from 25,000*l.* to 50,000*l.* on Roman Catholics, the children of each would be educated, not only

apart, but, I fear, with even aggravated feelings of unfriendly jealousy. I need not dilate on the consequences likely to result.

I beg to observe, that, when I speak of the designs of his Majesty's Ministers, I am stating only my own *conjectures;* having had no intimations from them on the subject, beyond what is before the Public.

Although therefore I am, as I have said, not confident of the success of the proposed experiment, I am anxious that, at all events, its failure should not be justly imputable to *us;* and I think we ought therefore to give it a fair trial: I mean, by merely offering no impediment to the adoption of the plan in those places where both *Roman Catholics and Protestants* may agree in thinking that there are no better means of accomplishing the object.

For, that such a plan is recommended for universal adoption in preference to all others, as in itself the best, is one of the many misconceptions that are afloat. Those who may either disapprove of it altogether, or think it not adapted to their own immediate neighbourhood, have only to *abstain from applying* for aid out

of the fund in question. And I can conceive that a person who had two parishes, in different parts of the Country, and differently circumstanced, might, consistently, adopt a different course in each. If in the one there were a hundred or more children of poor Protestants, and only eight or ten Roman Catholics, and there existed, or might be established, a school on the system of the "Association for Discountenancing Vice," he might not think it worth while to make any alteration in that, for the chance of benefiting a very small proportion: if, in the other, there were but eight or ten children either Protestants, or who could be brought to attend such a school, and several hundreds of Roman Catholics who would not, he might think it worth while to encounter the difficulties and inconveniences either of the system of the Kildare-street Society,* or of that now proposed. I say "difficulties and inconveniences," because though I hold each of these to be an *imperfect* system, I am convinced that it is possible, in either, by *increased labour and care* to *supply* the deficiency.

* See Note, p. 225.

The reading of the Bible, (even if it were read all through, instead of merely such passages as the master may think fit to select,) without any explanation to the children, and examination of them in the matter of it, would, *alone*, be a very defective Scriptural education. But that defect may be supplied. And again, even if they received no religious instruction whatever during school hours, on four or five days in the week, yet if the Protestant clergyman, or other well-qualified instructors, would devote from half an hour to an hour on each of those days, and from two to four hours on each of the other two or three days in each week, to the religious instruction of the children,—training them not merely to *read* the Scriptures, but to "mark, learn, and inwardly digest them,"—and supplying them with Bibles, and also with useful manuals to read at home, in which they might from time to time be examined,—if all this were done, no one can doubt that their pupils would be enabled to turn out better divines than the generality, even of the higher orders, actually are.

But certainly this would cost their instructors

more trouble than would be required in a differently constituted school.

And if some selections from Scripture, sanctioned as unobjectionable by Protestants, should be adopted as a school-book, this I should regard as an advantage, provided it did not lead us to neglect all *other* religious instruction. Mrs. Trimmer's Abridgments, and many other books of that kind (*which have long been in use in schools*) would be hurtful if they were allowed to produce *that* effect;—if they were made to furnish a plea for neglecting to impart the whole Bible to all that can be brought to receive it. And again I should regard it as an evil, that any one should suppose a child to have received a religious education, merely on the ground of his having read the *words* of the whole Bible itself, without any care having been taken to make him take in the sense of it. I know from long experience in education, how little will generally be understood by children, if thus left to themselves, even of words which they can fluently repeat by rote.

Though I was prepared to expect objections against the proposed plan, I am rather surprised

that it should have been by some found fault with as something *novel* and unheard-of; because, as a part of the Mendicity-Institution, supported by so many respectable persons, chiefly Protestants, a school on a similar plan has existed many years.

But it would be endless to notice all the rumours that are afloat;—as, that there is a design to suppress the Scriptures, or to substitute some portion of them for the whole;—that the plan is proposed for adoption in *all* schools as preferable to any other;—that the priests are to receive some authority which they do not now possess;—that the attendance of children at Roman Catholic divine service on Sundays is to be enforced;—that I am adverse to Scriptural education;—and many others equally groundless. It is, I trust, almost superfluous to say that all these are either altogether mistakes, or misrepresentations and distorted exaggerations of the truth. If I were to attend to and investigate "every idle word" that has been spoken against me, I should have little else to do: but I trust that most, at least, of my Clergy have too much candour and

discretion to give implicit credit to them. I, on my part, will take care to leave no just ground for them; and I leave it to time to bring the truth to light.

But I should add, that, strongly disapproving as I do of the Romish system, I do not think it allowable to oppose it by any kind of coercive measures. That *they* have acted, or are ready to act, in that manner towards others, would not justify *us* in following such an example. If parents *choose* to send their children to a Roman Catholic priest for instruction, I must ever maintain that those Christians "know not what manner of spirit they are of" who would go about to prevent them by any other means than meek and patient persuasion.

I have been led into a greater length of detail than I wished, or anticipated, from a desire to lay before the Chapter the views and feelings with which I accepted this troublesome and thankless office. I was induced by no personal or party considerations; having indeed never been in any way bound to *any* party, political or religious; but holding it my right, and duty, to consider each question that arises, separately

on its own merits. And I entreat you to put yourselves in my place, and reflect calmly on the difficulties by which I am surrounded. I do not mean, the difficulty of escaping labour and obloquy; for, those I have no right to shrink from; but of steering such a course as to do all the good, and prevent all the evil, that circumstances will permit.

I might have been spared much anxious and harassing toil, and probably not a little vituperation, by declining to act. And I might have endeavoured to satisfy my conscience by setting forth a pleasing picture of the best and most complete system of education for the poor; a picture, defective only in being impossible to be realized, in respect of the great majority of those who stand most in need of education. But I could not thus satisfy my conscience, when I contemplated the practical results likely to follow.

Even now, I should probably gain something in point of credit, and certainly a great deal in point of ease, by withdrawing. But I feel (as I observed to you the other day) that the rod which I am holding

will become, like Aaron's, a serpent, if I cast it down.

Consider but the consequences. Suppose another person appointed in my place; perhaps more, perhaps less, fit; but at all events, exposed, through my resignation, to a still more violent storm of obloquy. In the upshot, the opposition of Protestants would probably lead to the exchanging of the present plan for the other I alluded to;—that of *dividing* the government grant among the different sects and churches. In the meantime, an outcry would be raised too plausible not to produce a strong sensation, that we will not aid in imparting, nor permit others to impart, an important political benefit to our countrymen, except under condition of their doing violence to their conscience, and renouncing obedience to their Church in the first instance,—on the threshold,—before they shall have received sufficient rudiments of knowledge to enable them to judge which religion has truth on its side. This complaint, whether well or ill-founded, would find its way, in addition to all the other topics calculated to foment political and religious animosity, into the

separate Roman Catholic Schools, supported by their share of the government grant. And what chance would then remain of the Irish peasantry ever being enlightened, conciliated, and reclaimed from ferocious barbarism?

If, on the other hand, the proposed experiment should fail (as it very likely may) through the opposition of the Roman Catholics themselves, I cannot but hope for better results. At any rate, the evils ensuing would be less; and would, at the worst, not be imputable to ourselves.

I cannot but think it advisable, therefore, that the Clergy should at least pause on such a question;—should wait for a time, to observe and to re-deliberate; weighing well the consequences of every step they feel disposed to recommend;—and should consider whether objections may not be obviated and dangers guarded against, and deficiencies supplied, by our exertions, in a case where, as in the present, we have before us only a choice of difficulties.

Believe me, &c. &c.

January 18, 1832.

REPLY

TO A

MEMORIAL FROM THE CLERGY OF DERRY.*

REVEREND SIRS,

To the Memorial presented to me from the diocese of Derry, I can only reply at present, that I am as anxious as they can be for the diffusion of the Holy Scriptures, and for the promotion of the best education among all classes, that the circumstances of each will admit. Several of the sentiments contained in the Memorial are such, that, though I heartily concur in them, I do not understand their applicability to the present question. And on several points, if I do not mistake the meaning of it, it seems to imply misconceptions of the plan

* See Memorial, p. 209.

alluded to, which might be cleared up by referring to the printed paper which the Commissioners have issued.* I hope it will not be regarded as any mark of disrespect, that I am unable to enter fully into separate discussions with all who bring before me their objections or suggestions relative to this subject. It would, in fact, be impossible for me to do so, even if I had no other avocations. I will beg leave, therefore, to refer you to a letter which I have sent to the Dean and Chapter of St. Patrick's, (and which I have no doubt they will be ready to lay before you,) which adverts to several of the topics of the present Memorial. I do not, however, expect that what I have there said will prove universally satisfactory. In fact, to seek for perfectly satisfactory answers to all the objections that may be urged, (or even to all that may be reasonably urged,) against any scheme that ever was devised by man, would be an endless and a hopeless task. The utmost that can ever be hoped for is to fix on the plan that shall be open to the fewest and the

* See page 220.

least weighty objections; and, accordingly, we can hardly expect that objections to any scheme will be much listened to by the framers of it unless *some other, less* objectionable, be proposed in its stead. Allow me, then, to suggest to my reverend brethren, that they should consult together (if possible with the assistance or concurrence of their bishop,) to devise some plan of national instruction which they may agree upon, as (I do not say, absolutely the best, but) the best that can be reduced to practice. If any such shall be resolved on, which shall appear to be preferable to the one proposed by Mr. Stanley, as affording, on the one hand, a better education to the children, and, on the other hand, obviating the scruples (unreasonable as they may be) which might deter Roman Catholics from availing themselves of it, I shall be most ready to use my best endeavours towards recommending it to his Majesty's Government.

REPLY

TO THE

ADDRESS OF THE CLERGY OF DUBLIN.*

DEAR MR. ARCHDEACON,

It is highly gratifying to me to be addressed by my Clergy in the language of kindness and esteem, and to hear from them sentiments of conciliation. I am almost ashamed, indeed, to appear to bestow commendations on the expression of that courtesy and Christian feeling which might be expected from almost every one. But these are times of such strong excitement, from political and religious controversy, that (as you need not be told) but too many have been led to forget what is due to Christian candour

* See Address, p. 201.

and Christian meekness. It is in such times that I feel the value, more than ever, of the friendly union of my Clergy with me and with each other; of moderation, charitable forbearance, and gentleness of demeanour; and it is in such times that those who evince these qualities may claim merit for not being influenced by the contrary examples which surround them. Not that I would reckon it a matter of praise to a gentleman and a Christian to abstain from gross scurrility and calumny; but it is a matter of praise to be in no degree affected by the prevalence of these. For bad examples produce, perhaps, the greatest amount of mischief in those who do *not* altogether *follow* them; but who are led by them to *lower their standard of propriety*, and to deem their own conduct temperate, because it falls so much short of the intemperance of others.

For myself, it is well known to all my acquaintance in England, that I have always kept aloof (as I ever shall) from all parties, and from all controversies, ecclesiastical or political. And all my tastes and habits would have led me (at any time, but especially at such a period as the

present) to prefer remaining at Oxford, to entering on an office of so much difficulty and harassing toil as the Archbishopric presents. As far as my own comfort and enjoyment are concerned, I made a sacrifice to which nothing could have induced me but a sincere desire and hope of being able to do service to the Church and to the Country. I felt indeed that I could not, with a safe conscience, decline the offer; made, as it was, by those with whom I had not the slightest personal or political connexion. I conceived that I was as distinctly *called* to take upon me the office, when so proposed, as any one can be, under the ordinary administration of Divine Providence: and I have the more hope, therefore, that my prayers, and those of my Christian brethren in my behalf, will be heard; and that the same gracious Providence will direct and support me in the arduous undertaking. Whatever failure and disappointment may await me, I shall endeavour to bear, without grieving on my own account, by doing my best to be able, through God's grace, to say with truth, that the fault does not rest with me.

And my earnest wish is, that my brethren in the ministry may be able with truth to say the same: that whatever disasters to the Establishment may be impending, may not (even apparently) be imputable to any indiscretion, intemperance, or unfairness on *our* part. Never was there a time in which the union of sober judgment with mildness as well as firmness,—of the wisdom of the serpent with the harmlessness of the dove,—was more called for: and never could we less afford to be disunited.

I have ever been (and, I trust, shewn myself) sensible, that no good can result from any exertions of mine, without the cooperation of my Clergy. And this cooperation, I may confidently say, I shall obtain, if they will be as ready on their part as I shall ever be on mine. I wish for no more of brotherly kindness and candour than I am ready myself to manifest towards them: I am always glad to avail myself of their advice, and to put the most favourable interpretation on what they say and do. I have laboured, and I trust not altogether in vain, to vindicate them in the eyes of the Public from

unjust imputations. Whatever influence I possess, (which however is no more than that of a man without any personal or political claims on Government,) I have exerted in favour of what I have thought their just demands; I am desirous to concur with them as far as I can; and, when compelled to differ from any of them in opinion, to differ without hostile and uncharitable feelings. And I ask but the same in return.

In the present instance, however, I know not that there is, necessarily, even any difference of opinion between myself and most of the Clergy who have addressed me.

From all that I have been able to learn, I have been convinced that no one description of School can be the best adapted to all parishes alike. From differences in the circumstances of different places,—in the character of the inhabitants,—in the proportions of those of the different persuasions,—and probably in other points which I have not yet been able to ascertain,—it appears that the same system which accomplishes, in one parish, the object of imparting general instruction, will, in another,

fall very short of it. The rector of each parish must be left to judge what system is best suited to his own. And I am very far from wishing that a more imperfect system should be introduced in any place where one intrinsically better can be made available. Even the plan of the Kildare-place schools* was not, I conceive, advocated by any, as, in itself, perfect; but as being, in some places, the best that could be received. And in some places again, even this (it has been represented to me) has failed to accomplish its object: insomuch that the total number of Roman Catholic children educated at these schools does not exceed one-half of the entire number, instead of amounting to five-sixths or more; which, considering the relative numbers of those needing gratuitous education, of each persuasion, would have been, I understand, the fairer proportion.

Under these circumstances, it was proposed to me to lend my assistance in the disposal of a Government-grant for Schools on a modified plan. I never understood that it was intended

* See Note, p. 225.

to substitute such Schools for those on a more perfect system, in any place where such should have been introduced and found to succeed; but to rescue from hopeless ignorance those who (whether by their own fault or otherwise) could not be brought to avail themselves of any better plan. And I felt myself bound (not in compliance with the wishes of any individuals, but in duty to the Public) to take on myself an irksome and invidious office, with the hope of being instrumental in diminishing the evil of popular ignorance under which this Country has so long suffered.

I have been driven to speak more of myself than is consistent with good taste, or with my own feelings and habits, by the numberless misrepresentations which have been industriously circulated. One of them is, that I came hither pledged to give an unqualified support to every measure of the present ministry. Whereas there is nothing that would induce me to resign my independence in a single point. I am, and always have been, perfectly free to act according to the dictates of my own judgment and conscience in each case that may occur; nor would

I ever support or oppose any measure, because of its being proposed by this or that ministry.

But in the present instance, I know not what plea I could have urged for refusing to act. Had I complained of the grants being withdrawn from the Association, and from the Kildare-place Institution, it would have been answered, that no one ought to blame *me* for that, since it was not done at my suggestion;—that, in fact, the nation's money was neither mine, nor that of his Majesty's Ministers, to dispose of at our pleasure; and that a renewal of those grants, if proposed in Parliament, would inevitably be refused. Of this indeed I was actually assured; and it was not in my power to gainsay it.

If I had urged that the use of the Bible should be permitted to all, and that the Roman Catholic priests have no right to prevent it, I might have been answered that it *is* permitted, to all who *will* use it; but that we are not authorised to force it on any:—that if the people *choose* to submit, as a matter of conscience, to the prohibitions of the priest, we must not, however we may deplore their error,

do violence to their conscience :—that they have no *means* of disobeying a prohibition to read the Bible, if they are left unable to read :—that it would be unfair to require them to shake off this control, in the first instance, as a preliminary condition to their acquiring the knowledge which may enable them to decide whether the control is just or unjust :—and, finally, that to recognise the *civil right* of all men to submit their conscience, however erroneously, to whatever rule of faith they think fit, does not imply any acknowledgment that their conduct is *right* in the sight of God.

And here permit me to remark by the way, the incalculable importance of the distinction between a *civil* or political right on the one hand, and a *moral* right on the other. I believe the neglect of this distinction has contributed, more than any other cause, to lead many persons, of no harsh or cruel temper, into intolerance and persecution. It must be *wrong* to embrace and to propagate a false religion ; and it would be absurd to say that any one can have a *right* to do what is *wrong*. On this ground, heresy has been punished as a crime by

the secular arm. But the principle of toleration, without implying such an absurdity as that all different, and even opposite religious persuasions, can be right in the sight of God, recognizes the right (viz. the *civil* right) of every man to profess whatever religion he thinks best. In the same manner, it would be absurd to say that a man has a right, *morally* speaking, to spend his money and his time exclusively on frivolous amusements, and to give away nothing to the poor: but every man has a *civil* right, provided he does not violate the laws, to spend his money and time as he pleases; otherwise indeed they could not properly be called *his;* nor could any one be said to *give* what he had no legal right to withhold.

Had I deprecated the substitution of any compilation for the entire Bible, I should have been answered that no such *substitution* had been contemplated:—that if any compilation should receive the sanction of the Board, it would still be left *optional* with the local patrons of each School to use it or not:—and that where adopted, it should not be received as a

substitute for the Scriptures; the reading of which (with or without explanations and catechetical instruction) might be introduced on one, two, or three entire days of every week, and also during stated portions of the other days, as the conductors might appoint; leaving them at liberty to afford such instruction to all who *chose* to receive it; and only restricting them from making the reception of that instruction an *indispensable* condition of admittance into the School:—that it is clearly impossible for *complete* religious instruction to be afforded to those of *different* religious persuasions, *simultaneously*, even were they all Protestants; yet that teaching them together, as far as they can be brought to agree, does not imply the substitution of an incomplete for a complete instruction, provided liberty is left to instruct them separately in points wherein they disagree:—that the word "mutilation," would be very improperly applied to *avowed selections* and abridgments; the Church of England, for instance, never having been charged with *mutilating* the Scriptures, on the ground of the Prayer-book containing selections from them;

selections which, even including the Lessons for each day, do not nearly embrace the whole Bible :—and that a "mutilated" book means, according to all the usage of the language hitherto, one which *professes* to be *entire* when it is *not;* as, for instance, when any one strikes out as spurious (which some have done) the opening chapters of Matthew or Luke, and then presents the book to us *as the New Testament,* we should rightly term *this* a mutilation. And in like manner, on the principles of the Roman Catholics, who acknowledge the Apocrypha as Scripture, they would characterize what *we* call the Bible, as mutilated. That any book selected or compiled from Scripture (it might have been added) should "come before the children as the work of man," is desirable and even indispensable; inasmuch as it is important to guard them against supposing it to be intended as a substitute for the entire Bible. *Every selection* from Scripture, whether formally and deliberately transcribed in a separate book, or made orally and extemporaneously, on each occasion, by the teacher, is, so far as it is a selection, a human work; and it is of the more

consequence that this should be distinctly understood.

And lastly, it might have been observed, that it is a usual and a right practice for those who afford, either orally or in their works, religious instruction to children, to substitute (without any idea of throwing contempt on our valuable authorized translation) other words and phrases for such as have either become obsolete, or are otherwise likely to perplex or mislead learners of tender years.

If, again, I had expressed my suspicions that the Roman Catholic priesthood would oppose every honest selection from Scripture, and that they would contrive, by direct or indirect means, to defeat every plan for enlightening the minds of the lower orders, the answer, I think, would have been, "Then at least let *theirs* be the act, and theirs the reproach of it: if it be so, that the priests are resolved by every machination, and under every pretext they can devise, to preclude their flocks from the benefits of education, let the endeavour of Protestants, be, in the first place, if possible, to defeat their machinations, and to deprive them of all

reasonable pretext; in the next place, at all events, to shew to every one, that the fault is not their own."

And in truth, I could not but have acknowledged that there was good reason for making every offer that could fairly be required, even if one could have been morally *certain* that the priests were only studying to find the best pretence they could for evading it. Suppose this the case: it is for us, not the less, to deprive them of all *fair* and plausible pretence, and to compel those who are really opposed to the diffusion of education, to *avow* that opposition, instead of counteracting our measures by a side-wind. We should thus not only clear ourselves, but open the eyes of others as to *who* those are that wish to shut the gates of knowledge against them.

On the other hand, "Imagine (it might have been said to me) the feelings of a priest, if there be any such, who dreads education, yet is ashamed to acknowledge that dread; imagine him, with painful anxiety, considering and contriving how he shall keep the people in ignorance, and yet avoid the odium of doing so;

and then, think of the exultation with which such a man would see *Protestants* coming forward to accomplish his object for him;—combining to oppose every system of education which he could not reasonably or plausibly object to! Would he not exclaim with inward triumph,

> ——'quod optanti Divûm promittere nemo
> Auderet, volvenda dies, en, attulit ultro?'

And would he not doubly rejoice that Protestants should have not only defeated the measure he dreaded, but have exposed themselves to reproach for so doing;—that he should be enabled to hold them up to obloquy, as refusing to cooperate in affording education to the poor, except on conditions offensive to their conscience?"

Whether the Roman Catholic priests, or the generality of them, were sincerely desirous to further the diffusion of knowledge, or merely seeking some specious pretence for defeating it in an oblique manner, I could not of course have ventured to decide; but I could not have denied that, on *either* supposition, the course which Protestants ought to adopt must be the same; since, on the one supposition, we might expect

the honest cooperation of the Romish Clergy, and, on the other, we ought to leave with *them* the reproach of being the opposers of popular instruction, instead of suffering them to raise an outcry against us for defeating the very measure which, at heart, they themselves most deprecated.

Had I raised any doubts respecting the registry of the children's attendance or non-attendance on Divine worship, I should have been (in fact I was) assured that there was not the least design of *compelling* the attendance of any. Nevertheless finding that great objections have been raised against this rule, and thinking, that, though many of these are founded on misapprehension, the regulation is not in itself desirable, I have made a suggestion to the Board, which has been adopted and acted on, to request that it may be rescinded. And this, I trust, will satisfy all those who have, in sincerity, opposed the plan on that ground.

If I had objected to the regulation which subjects books for religious instruction to the supervision of the several portions of the Board, I might have been asked whether I did not

think it possible that, unless I were allowed such control, ill-chosen books might be placed in the hands of members of my own Church.* I am aware indeed that books containing, in my view, "unsound religious opinions," may be placed in the hands of Protestants of other persuasions: but this is no consequence of the regulation in question. I deplore the "exposing of the children of the Protestant population to the pernicious effects" of books that teach such doctrines: but how is this to be prevented? We cannot surely expect that Dissenters will allow to *our* Clergy the choice of books for their children; with, or without, the regulation in question, the members of each Church and Sect *will* (and must, unless liberty of conscience be abolished) use books selected by those whom they have themselves chosen for their spiritual guides.

But I cannot feel satisfied that I have rightly understood the meaning of the objection in

* The Bible and the *authorized* formularies of any Church are not included in this restriction, but may be used in the separate religious instruction of the children of each denomination without any reference to the Board.

question; since, according to the most simple and obvious construction of the words, it is plainly inapplicable to any of the regulations of the Board. There must surely be some mistake somewhere. Perhaps it may be that the regulation in question has been misunderstood, as implying that Protestant *Dissenters*, who are members of the Board, are to have some controul over the books to be used by the members of *our* Church. If *this* be the impression that has gone abroad, I am happy to say there never was any foundation for it.

If I had urged the importance of leaving each School as much as possible under "the controul of the local patrons," I should have been told that it was designed to leave *them* to fix the school-hours; to leave them the use, in these, of whatever books they may choose, which are not likely to raise conscientious scruples in the minds of any; — that they may also summon, every day, all who *choose* to come, at any hour (say at 10 instead of 11) before or after the general school-hours, for the *express* purpose of reading the Bible, with or without comment, and of receiving any other religious instruction; and

that they may devote besides, one or two, or three entire days, in each week, to that purpose. This proceeding (it might have been added) is very much what has been in many Schools *spontaneously* adopted by the most judicious local patrons.

Had I contended that the Roman Catholic population "are every day becoming more desirous of obtaining the Scriptures," and ought not to be deprived of them,—that their desertion of certain Schools "has been the result not o choice on the part of the people, but of religious tyranny on the part of the Roman Catholic priesthood,"—and that the proposed system is "grounded on an assumption that the population is indisposed to Scriptural Education,"—I should have been assured that it is grounded on no such assumption; the very consideration of which indeed would be totally irrelevant:—that the question is not about the *cause* of the desertion of Schools, but the *fact*;—that if the people are *actually* left in ignorance, it is no consolation to know that they *would* willingly learn, if their priests would give them leave;—that their being desirous of the Scriptures is no advantage to

them unless they learn to read, though it is an encouragement to us to teach them:—that to teach a child to read, and then offer him a Bible, cannot properly be called "depriving him" of the Bible; but that he *would* be virtually deprived of it by our refusing to teach him except on conditions which his parents, under the terrors of a mistaken conscience, would not allow him to comply with: and that to lay the blame of this, however justly, on the priests, neither justifies ourselves nor cures the evil: *that* must be effected by adopting a system which will leave the priests no excuse for seeking to withdraw the children from the Schools.

If I had urged that, in most parishes of my diocese, "Schools were established, in which Protestant and Roman Catholic children were brought up in the principles of the Church of England," I should have been answered, that there is no reason for altering the constitution of any School, where such instruction is willingly received by the generality of the population; but that the aid of Parliament was about to be solicited for the purpose (the only one for which it was likely to be obtained) of meeting the wants

of parishes that are *not* so circumstanced, and of imparting such a degree of instruction as is likely to be accepted, to several hundred thousand children who are now destitute of any.

Had I alleged my obligation to "drive away all erroneous and strange doctrines," and to sanction no "catechisms that teach doctrines and practices repugnant to the word of God;" I might have been answered, that I was not sanctioning any such thing, by merely permitting to all men the free exercise of their own religion, however erroneous;—that it is by argument and persuasion only that the Clergy are either bound, or able, to drive away erroneous doctrines: and *this,* from among their *own* flocks, *i. e.* all who will consent to listen to them; and that the driving away of strange doctrines from among those who renounce our communion, and *will* not listen to our arguments, can only be attempted by the introduction of secular force; which is precisely the system that Protestants are accustomed to censure in the Romanists.

And had I contended that the "National Clergy ought to be recognised as the proper

guardians of national education," and that " a preponderating influence should be assigned to the purity of religious truth, rather than to the numerical superiority of the members of any communion," the reply would have been, that the grant would be asked for national education in *Ireland,* in the sense of an education of which the mass of the Irish nation are likely to avail themselves;—that the National Church, in the sense of the *Established* Church, is one which (unhappily) the majority of the nation will not permit to have the entire and uncontrolled guardianship of education; that the Legislature does not *deprive* our Clergy of this, because in fact they have never had it; nor can the Legislature confer it on us, except by coercive measures, which we ourselves should deprecate; and that our claim of a preponderating influence in education, on the ground of the *truth* and purity of our religion, can only be admitted by those who acknowledge that truth; since Romanists and Dissenters contend, no less, each, that truth is on *their* side.

If a clergyman of the Establishment (it might have been added) conducts a School on the

principle of requiring all the children to be instructed in the doctrines of our Church, and can induce the great body of his parishioners to send their children to it, he is to be commended and congratulated; if, on the contrary, the majority of them refuse to send their children to the School, and he still judges it best to adhere to his system, for the greater benefit of the smaller number that *will* attend, no one disputes his right to do so: but then, he ought not to complain that the *Legislature* seeks to *deprive* him of the superintendence of the education of that majority of his parishioners. If he does not, in point of fact, possess that control, he cannot be deprived of it. And if he have it in his power to impart a certain degree of education to those who refuse to receive the *full* benefit of his instructions, but does not think fit to do so, however right he may be in this, it is clearly *he himself* that has withdrawn from the only share he *could* have had in the superintendence of their education; unless, indeed, he would have the children *compelled* to attend his School. And if the mass of his parishioners are, in consequence, left in hopeless ignorance, or left to

imbibe the first rudiments of knowledge in close conjunction with what he considers an erroneous faith, he may blame their own blindness and perversity ;—he may blame the tyranny of their priests ;—but he cannot fairly blame Government for depriving him of what was not his to lose, or for not giving him what is not theirs to give.

And finally, if I had expatiated, *separately*, on each of several important points, each of which, by itself, might have been shown to be both a desirable and an attainable object to be aimed at in a plan of education, and had then found fault with the proposed plan as deficient in this point and in that, I might fairly have been required to show how all these objects could have been accomplished *together*. A man may have it in his power to go to a place where he wishes to be, either by sea, or by land; and there may be advantages in each mode of travelling ; but if he is resolved to forego *none* of these advantages, he can never set out.*

It is (we will suppose) desirable, 1st, That all

* See p. 212.

the poor children in Ireland should be enabled to learn to read: 2dly, That the "children of different religious persuasions should be instructed in one common School, for the sake of the kindly feelings generated by means of an association in childhood:" 3dly, That "religious and literary instruction should proceed together hand in hand:" 4thly, That the "study of the entire Scriptures should be the basis of education:" 5thly, That the Established Clergy should be entrusted with the "superintendence of national education," and should drive out all erroneous doctrines: 6thly, That "a preponderating influence should be assigned, not to the numerical superiority in the members of any communion, but to the superiority in point of purity of faith:" 7thly, That none of the Roman Catholic children should be withheld by the priests from participating in the proposed plan of education: 8thly, That "the appointment of governors, teachers, and scholars, should" (as in the Kildare-place Schools) "be uninfluenced by religious distinctions;" and 9thly, That "no means should be used for spreading truth but those of moral suasion." Now, had I maintained separately the

desirableness of each of these objects, and complained that this and that are wanting in the proposed scheme, I might have been asked whether by any plan, and by what, *all* these advantages could be *combined;* and whether, if none such can be devised, either ministers or myself ought to be blamed, for not having united objects essentially incompatible.

If, to such objections as the above, (supposing I had offered them,) I had received such answers as those I have here supposed, I should not have known what reply to make. And I did not therefore feel myself justified, (however strongly I felt the sacrifice I was making of my own time, comfort, and quiet) in refusing the office proposed to me.

You will observe that I have (at the risk, I fear, of some tedious repetition) followed the order of the several heads of the Memorial presented to me; being anxious to make my sentiments clearly understood, and to show how carefully I have perused it.

It is so much easier to point out objections,— not only apparent and plausible, but real and valid objections, — to *any* plan that can be

suggested, in the difficult circumstances of this Country, than to devise one which shall be unobjectionable, that I was not surprised to find some party-writers confess their mortification and resentment at my having suggested, to those who find fault with the plan in question, the endeavour to frame a better. It was substituting a very difficult for a very easy task. But I have nothing to do with party-politics; and I protest to you and to the rest of my Clergy, as to men of the same mind in that respect as myself, that I did not put forth that suggestion as a hostile defiance, but as one on which I really did honestly act myself; by deliberating long and earnestly, with a view to frame the least exceptionable system that could accomplish the object proposed, of imparting to the mass of the Irish nation the utmost amount of beneficial instruction that they could be brought to receive.

In a case like the present, where there are several different objects presenting themselves as desirable, but some of them incompatible with others, it must be expected that there will be differences of opinion as to which shall

be preferred. But I do not know that there is, necessarily, any difference of opinion between one who does, and one who does not, resolve to apply to the Board for aid towards a School in his own parish. What description of School is the best that the circumstances of the place will allow, is a question which will, in different districts, I apprehend, admit of very different answers. I have no reason to conclude that the applicants to the Board, (which has already granted aid to Schools containing above 6,000 children,) and the highly respectable individuals who have signified to me, personally, and by letter, their approbation of the plan,—I have no reason, I say, to conclude that they, any more than myself, regard the system to which the government-grant is limited, as, in itself, a perfect one; but only as being, in many cases, the best that can be made available. Nor, again, do I suppose that the supporters of the Kildare-place system necessarily regarded that, as, in itself, unexceptionable; but as one which *could* be introduced, and beneficially introduced, among those who could not be brought to receive a more complete religious education

I think it would be very unfair to infer that, because in those Schools the Scriptures are read without note or comment, and without any inculcation of peculiarly Protestant doctrines, therefore, the supporters of those Schools are to be regarded as pronouncing all notes and comments superfluous, and as indifferent about the Protestant tenets.

And if the supporters of that system consider it to be, either in any particular instance, or universally, preferable to that to which the grant has been now offered,—or if they even regard the latter as altogether objectionable,—I should be sorry to see them assailed with rancorous hostility for forming and expressing their own sincere and unbiassed opinions. But I do think they are in fairness precluded from urging against the system now in question the very *same* objections which apply equally against their own.

The Douay version, for instance, is permitted to be used under that system; and yet loud complaints are made against the Board, on the ground of its being likely to sanction (not *enforce*) the use of a book of selections, *some* of which may be conformable to that version. I

do not by any means attribute to the promoters of the Kildare-place Schools any wish to bring our "authorized version into contempt;" and I agree with them in thinking that there is no translation of the Bible extant which is not better than none, when that is the alternative: but surely we are equally entitled to a candid construction; at least from those who have the same need of it.

Again, the system has been bitterly censured for not leaving national education entirely under the control of the national Clergy, and for "encouraging" the clergy of different persuasions to afford religious instruction to their respective flocks. The "encouragement" (as every candid reader must perceive) implies merely, leaving them, what they now have, unimpeded access to those who choose to receive their instructions: and if this were to be hindered, we should certainly be using means beyond those of "moral suasion." The word "encouraged" is perhaps (for this very reason) ill-chosen; but I could not have expected this system and this language to have been censured by those who have used the very same: *e.g.*

the following are extracts from Reports of the Kildare-place Society, to which, among others, the Memorial refers me.

"No attempt shall be made to influence or disturb the peculiar religious tenets of any sect or denomination of Christians; and the Society never had it in view to make proselytes." And again:—

"The Committee *warmly recommend* to the several pastors, the necessity of imparting religious instruction to the children of their respective flocks, out of school-hours; by which means the comparatively few passages that may be hard to be understood, may be interpreted to the children *according to the peculiar opinions* of their respective pastors."—*Report*, 1823.

Again, the system is complained of for not allowing the entire Bible to be put into the hands of children during the whole of *every* day in the week. Now as it cannot be meant that the *whole* Bible should be read through every day, the drift of this objection must be understood to be, that the religious instruction, during school-hours, is not *unrestricted*, so as to em-

brace every thing that we regard as necessary towards the inculcation of a right faith. Whatever may be the inconvenience, abstractedly, of such a restriction, it ought not to have been made a matter of complaint by those who have been obliged themselves to introduce it, in order to meet the objection which would otherwise have been raised by Roman Catholics against their Schools: "Whilst the Society prohibits, *during school-hours*, catechetical instruction in which scholars of different religious persuasions could not *unite*, it leaves the managers at perfect liberty to make such arrangements, as to the days and hours during which the Schools shall be opened for united instruction, as may afford abundant opportunity for catechetical and other particular religious instruction *out* of school-hours."—*Report*, 1832.

The tone of this regulation seems to imply (what, indeed, I never doubted) that the Kildare-place Society regards "particular religious instruction out of school-hours," as needful. In addition to the "perfect liberty to make arrangements" for this, the Board goes a step further, in requiring at least one day in each

week (besides Sunday) to be left open for that purpose.

I beg to repeat, that I do not understand the patrons of the Kildare-place Society, as considering their own system to be in itself perfect; but only, as, in many places, the best that can be made available. But it surely is neither fair nor wise to declaim against others for adopting a measure certainly not more objectionable than they themselves thought necessary.

Where Schools on the Kildare-place plan, or on one intrinsically better, are found to work well, and to embrace the great mass of the population, I should be truly sorry to see an inferior one substituted. But in the many districts where the case is otherwise, it does seem to me highly desirable that at least an attempt should be made to impart *some* useful knowledge to those who would otherwise either be left in hopeless ignorance, or would learn more evil than good, from perhaps some hedge-schoolmasters, who may be secretaries to a band of incendiaries. The failure of this attempt, if it does fail, will be a very different event, according

as it may be clearly attributable to Roman Catholic priests, or to Protestants. Those of the former who may really be averse to education, will be far too wise, I imagine, to exert themselves against it, if they find that Protestants are doing their work for them. In the other case, they must either abandon their attempt, or *avow* it.

In the case of some applications for aid that have come before the Board already, (and the same may be expected, I suppose, in some future cases,) the parish ministers of the Establishment, have, it appears, been applied to, and have refused to join. If they persist in keeping aloof from the Schools, it is not unlikely that some of these may be worse conducted than if they had taken a part. Should any one of them reply that his conscience will not permit him to do this, there is no more to be said: but then he ought not to complain that the *Board has deprived* him of all share in the superintendence of education, of which he has resolved to deprive himself, by his own act; nor ought he to point to any case of ill success, as a fulfilment of a prophecy which has *caused*

its own fulfilment.* If it were to be generally given out, and believed, of any given street in Dublin, that no respectable person would live in it, the character would soon become a true one.

To me, I confess, it does appear that some measures which many are ready to stigmatize as a sinful compromise of truth, are not only justified but enjoined by the example of Him, who would not "quench the smoking flax;"—who did not refuse all instruction, even to the multitudes, who, though they had seen his miracles, had not, as yet, joined Him as disciples;—who did not dismiss from Him his very disciples, for not at once embracing his whole Gospel; but laboured, with condescending patience, day after

* I grieve to be obliged to say that reports have in several instances been circulated of schools having been misconducted through *violation of our rules;* such imputed violation not having been *reported to the Board* by the persons who make this a ground of reproach. These reports, when they have reached us, have for the most part been found to be fabrications; but when they have been true,—or even have been *believed* by those who circulate them,—what an awful responsibility do those incur who, for the sake of having something to find fault with, neglect to inform the Board, which they know would take immediate steps to remedy the fault!

day, and year after year, in gradually enlightening the minds of poor, ignorant, bigoted Jews, "as they were able to bear it." With such an example before us, I do not think we are justified in requiring men brought up in ignorance, to *begin* by throwing off all subjection to those whom they have been trained to look up to as their spiritual guides, as an indispensable condition to their receiving from us the first rudiments of education, whereby they may be enabled to judge for themselves. And even if justified, I think we should be unwise, in foregoing, perhaps for ever, an opportunity which we may hereafter with vain regret wish to recall;—an opportunity of conciliating, as far as in us lies, a great part of the Irish population, by evincing a desire to enlighten them without doing violence to their prejudices;—an opportunity of, perhaps, conferring an extensive benefit, the greatest in our power to extend, though not so complete as we should wish; or, at all events, of showing that the benefit is not denied to them by *us*;—an opportunity of escaping, what, I think, we cannot otherwise escape, and what we shall probably never get

over, the reproach of having been averse or indifferent to the diffusion of education; or of having left it in the hands of those who will train the rising generation in principles and practices pernicious to themselves, and dangerous to us.

But those, who, after a deliberate and dispassionate consideration of the subject, feel themselves conscientiously bound to decide differently, I will still entreat to differ in opinion, without violence and rancorous hostility;—to treat with forbearance those who may be as conscientious as themselves; and evince so much of that Christian "charity, which thinketh no evil, and which is not puffed up," as may afford a presumption at least, that they are actuated by a Christian spirit. A man may be, in fact, right, in this or that point, and yet may be, himself, quite in the wrong: he may be a learned and orthodox theologian; yet though he "understand all mysteries and all knowledge, without charity it profiteth him nothing:" he may know all the Bible by heart, (that is, by head,) yet if he have not "put away all bitterness, and wrath, and anger, and clamour, and evil-speaking, with

all malice,"—if he is a stranger to Christian meekness and forbearance,—he has the *first rudiments* of evangelical religion yet to learn: "except he be converted, and become as a little child, he shall not enter into the kingdom of heaven."

I have been represented, and probably with truth, as an incompetent judge on many points relating to this Country, on account of the short time of my residence here: and I have ever shown myself an attentive and thankful listener to all who bring to my knowledge important and well-established facts. But I have known enough of this Country, unhappily, to convince me that it is a prey to the most mischievous and bitter dissension; not only between Christians, but between Protestants. I am sometimes painfully reminded of the closing scene of God's judgments on his once favoured People, when, at the last siege of Jerusalem, zealots, fired with religious confidence, raged against each other within the very precincts of the Temple, while the Romans were thundering at their walls. And I shudder to think what effects may be produced on the

mind of any one who may be in a wavering state as to the reception or rejection of our Religion, or of our Church, when he contemplates zealous professors using such virulent language, and displaying such furious passions as may but too often be met with.

O may we not stand chargeable with the heavy guilt of causing the truth to be "evil spoken of;"—of conducing to shake the faith of the wavering; and of sapping the foundations of our Church! May the Ministers of this diocese, and of this Church, deserve and inherit the blessing promised to "the peacemakers!" "Who is a wise man and endued with knowledge among you? let him show, out of a good conversation, his works, with meekness of wisdom. For the wisdom that is from above is first pure, then peaceable, gentle, and easy to be entreated, full of mercy and good works."

I have no design to weary you with commonplace general declamation in praise of Christian meekness and concord; which is generally unprofitable, because most men not only are ready to admit that strife is a bad thing, but also believe, and, in a certain sense, with truth, each,

that he is a lover of peace. I say, "with truth," since the most contentious man that ever lived would hardly acknowledge to himself that he loves contention for its own sake: he would be glad (at least he thinks he would be glad) of that peace which would result from every one's giving way to himself or to his party;—from every one's submitting to what is true and right; which, of course, his own opinions (if they are really his) appear to him to be. To distrust his own judgment, and reconsider his opinions, he regards as a want of faith; to be tolerant and forbearing towards those who are in error, great or small, he treats as a compromise of truth; "not to strive, but to be gentle to all men, in meekness instructing them that oppose themselves," and to "become all things to all men, that he may by all means gain some," he disdains as a base truckling to falsehood. But still he is, in a certain sense, desirous of peace: yet if the world were filled with such peacemakers (differing, as men ever will do, in opinion) it would be a scene of furious and interminable contention. And we cannot think that all of these would be entitled to the blessing pronounced on the peacemakers.

Something, whatever it be, and something which amounts to a distinction, and something consistent too with Christian zeal for truth, must be alluded to in that blessing.

Many able treatises have been written on the art of war: would that the art, whatever it is, of successfully "following after the things that make for peace," were as carefully studied! It is true, the cultivation of an humble, patient, and gentle disposition, that *ambition* for putting an end to contentious violence, which the Apostle recommends (ΦΙΛΟΤΙΜΕΙΣΘΑΙ *ἡσυχάζειν*, 1 Thess. iv. 11,)—this must be the first step; but it is only the first: this temper will tax the powers of the intellect to devise means for attaining its object. And means, I am convinced, may often be found which will prove more effectual than some would suppose. I am convinced, for instance, that it makes a great difference, whether, in our intercourse with any one, we *begin* by looking to the points of agreement, or to the points of difference. If we make it the first step, to ascertain how far we *coincide*, and dwell with evident satisfaction on those points, instead of at once looking out for

something to censure, the parties may sometimes be found to go together further than either had anticipated. Even thus did the Apostle proceed, when about to introduce new, and, in some points, unwelcome truths to the Athenians: he does not begin by reviling their frivolity and corruption, or (as the English reader is apt to suppose) their absurd "superstitions;" but addresses them as (δεισιδαιμονέστεροι) "very much disposed to a reverence for superhuman powers:" and thence proceeds to reveal to them the God "whom they ignorantly worshipped;" and quotes afterwards one of their own poets, in confirmation of what he is saying.

Next, we may endeavour to ascertain whether differences in some points may not have been exaggerated, and may not, in some degree, turn on the difference of the phrases used to express a similar sense. When, again, we perceive differences to be real, and important, we may still give credit, where we can, (and may show that we do so) for sincere good intentions, even to those in error. And even where we cannot but censure, in a moral point of view, the procedure of those opposed to us, we may

remember that such language and treatment as may be very fitting for them to receive, may be very unfitting for us to give. Their being aggressors, and their wide departure from the Christian character in what they say and do, will not justify even a much less departure from it in us; a departure from the pattern left us by Him who "when He was reviled, reviled not again."

And if, even when we find it necessary to take decided and strong steps, we nevertheless preserve temperance and gentleness in the *manner* of doing it, we shall at all events have been peacemakers as far as *we* ourselves are concerned." And in many instances we may hope that God will favour our efforts with success. For it is seldom that an acrimonious controversy can be very long kept up, when all the acrimony is on one side.

No doubt we shall at first find it a hard trial to the weakness of human nature, to preserve an equability of temper towards assailants who are destitute of it; and to remain at once undaunted and unprovoked. But the task will become easier by practice. We shall feel it, in some

sort, a compliment to be belied and misrepresented, as affording some presumption of our being invulnerable on the side of truth; and in being assailed by abuse, as indicating a deficiency of argument. We shall fortify our patience by the reflection that the stream of truth is gentle but permanent; while passionate party-clamour is like a winter torrent, impetuous, but transitory.

And, above all, we shall recollect how much we ourselves have to be forgiven;—what bright examples of long-suffering and of persevering benevolence are left us by our Lord and his Apostles;—and how dangerous it might prove to us to meet always with a full share of human favour and applause; which might draw our thoughts from "our Father who seeth in secret," and who has promised, if we follow those examples, to "reward us openly!"

In these sentiments, at least, I trust my Reverend Brethren will concur: and I do hope that some of those who do so, will not be content with merely abstaining, themselves, from falsehood and misrepresentation,—from personality and unchristian bitterness,—but will

openly testify against the employment of such means by those who, in a particular question, are ranged on their side. I should, myself, in any similar case, not only from principle but from feeling,—from regard to my own credit, and the credit of my cause, — deprecate its being so advocated; and call upon all, but especially on those who sided with me, to conduct the controversy with fairness and with Christian temper.

I have been led to describe at greater length than I had intended, and at the risk, I fear, of being tedious, the principles by which I have been actuated, and the objects I have at heart. I hope my Reverend Brethren will take in good part the suggestions I have thought it right to offer, and will be assured that I have expressed nothing but what I sincerely feel, nor recommended any thing that I am not willing to practise; that I have called for no more sympathy and favourable judgment than I am willing to bestow; and that the friendly and courteous tone of their address to me will always find a counterpart in my deportment towards them.

Palace, March, 1832.

MEMORIAL.

To the Most Reverend Father in God, RICHARD, *by Divine Providence*, LORD ARCHBISHOP OF DUBLIN, *&c.*

The Memorial of the Very Reverend the Dean and Chapter of the Collegiate and Cathedral Church of St. Patrick's, Dublin, January 11, 1832,

HUMBLY SHEWETH,

THAT we, the Dean and Chapter, desire to approach your Grace with assurances of respect for your character, and of willing subordination to your office.

That it would be with grief and pain that we should be found even expressing an opinion that might seem to imply a difference of sentiment or disunion in Council.

That as Members of the Established Church we must feel deeply interested in every proposed system of National Education, and especially in one intended for general adoption, and in which, from our stations, we should naturally be expected to take a part.

That we look with much anxiety and apprehension to the Commission lately appointed by Government for the purpose of promoting Education.

That our eyes naturally look to your Grace as a Member of the Board, and we earnestly implore your Grace not to give your sanction to any measures in which your Clergy may feel themselves conscientiously prevented from cooperating, either from the suppression of any portion of the Word of GOD, or from conceding to the Priests of the Roman Catholic Church, right and authority, which your Clergy never can concede to them. —In testimony whereof we have caused our common chapter seal to be hereunto affixed the day, year, and place, above written.

ADDRESS

OF

THE CLERGY OF DUBLIN.

To the Most Reverend Father in God, Richard, *by Divine Providence,* Lord Archbishop of Dublin, *Primate and Metropolitan of Ireland, and Bishop of Glandelough, &c.*

We, the Clergy of your Grace's Dioceses of Dublin and Glandelough, beg leave to approach your Grace, with every sentiment of sincere respect for your Grace's station and character, and with every feeling of unfeigned affection for that Church in which your Grace holds so distinguished a rank.

It is under the influence of that affection, and prompted by that respect, that we now venture to address your Grace, and to explain firmly, but we trust respectfully, the reasons by which we are prevented from cooperating

on the important subject of National Education, with the Board of which your Grace is a member. We are well aware, that, at this moment, any appearance of disunion among the members of the Established Church may prove detrimental to its interests; may afford its enemies an occasion of triumph, and perhaps, a means of injuring it; and we therefore beseech your Grace to believe, that nothing could induce us to come forward on the present occasion, but a conscientious conviction that such an explanation is due to your Grace as our respected diocesan, to the character of that Church whose ministers it is our privilege to be, and to the consistency of that practice which we have for years maintained, of giving a scriptural education, unrestricted as to time or mode, to the children, both Protestant and Roman Catholic, who have attended our schools. We would add too, that many of your Clergy have been already applied to for their cooperation with the Roman Catholic Clergy in the establishment of Schools under the New Board—a cooperation which they have felt themselves conscientiously bound to decline affording; and hence, they are the more strongly induced to lay before your Grace the reasons which have influenced them in that respect. We beg then most respectfully to state, that we cannot accept the assistance offered by the Board, nor carry into effect its purposed system—

Because, the Scriptures of the living *God*, which should be the groundwork of every national system of Education, are to be excluded, by national authority, from the Schools for united instruction, and their

use permitted, even to the Protestant children, only during a small portion of each week, and at a time when the children are separated from each other.

Because, by such an exclusion, the proposed system recognises, as of right, the unscriptural assumption of the Roman Catholic Clergy, that they may, at their pleasure, restrain or prevent the free use of the Scriptures.

Because, that no extracts from the Scriptures, particularly when framed to meet the wishes of a Board constituted as is the present one, can serve as a substitute for the sacred volume, or afford "an adequate representation of divine truth."

Because, that such a volume, however ably or honestly executed, must come before the children as the work of man, devoid of the authority and sanction that belongs to the *word of God.*

Because, that such a volume to be acceptable to the Roman Catholic hierarchy, must be in the language of the Douay and Rheims version of the Scriptures; and we conceive that, as members of the Established Church, we must protest against the contempt that would thus be poured upon the venerable Protestant translation, and the inconsistency of employing, in National Schools, a version of the Scriptures that is not national; nay, that has never been authoritatively recognized by the Church that partially sanctions its use.

Because it is manifest, from past experience, deduced alike from the experiment attempted by the Commissioners of Education Inquiry, and from the circumstances

that attended the extracts sanctioned by the Roman Catholic Archbishop, the Most Rev. Dr. Troy, and published for the use of Schools by the Kildare-place Society, that as much opposition may be anticipated from the Roman Catholic hierarchy and priesthood to an honest collection of scriptural extracts, as to the Bible itself.

Because, by a provision in the plan, a register is to be kept in each School, of the attendance of the children on divine worship; a provision which we venture to submit is either useless or pernicious; one which may end to produce hypocrisy in the parent, and rivet superstitious error upon the child: one which must necessarily form an impediment in the way of your Clergy spreading the reformed religion, and whose immediate effect must be to interfere with the usual course of Sunday-school instruction.

Because, that, by another arbitrary provision of the plan, not only are the books for united instruction to be submitted for approval to the whole Board, but those for separate religious instruction must be approved by that portion of the Board which professes the religious opinion of the children for whose use they are designed; and we would suggest, that, of the members of the Board who now share with your Grace this important trust, two are not our ecclesiastical superiors;—that they are individuals in whose appointment the Church has no voice; and that however ready we may be at all times to submit ourselves to your Grace's "godly admonitions," we cannot forget that there is no safeguard provided in

the plan against persons of unsound religious opinions being made your Grace's coadjutors; and we would shrink from exposing the children of the Protestant population to the pernicious effects of books selected under such auspices.

Because, the effect of the system must be to remove the schools from under the control of the local patrons and guardians, thereby loosening one of the strongest and most effective bonds that now unite the various ranks of society.

Because, the system is grounded upon an assumption which, from experience, we are enabled to say is unfounded in fact,—that the Roman Catholic population is indisposed to scriptural education. We have reason to know the reverse to be the case; and that when schools in which the Scriptures are used have been deserted, it has been the result, not of choice on the part of the people, but of religious tyranny on the part of the Roman Catholic hierarchy and priesthood.

Because, that already, in almost every parish of your Grace's diocese, schools have been established in which the Scriptures are read, and Protestant children carefully brought up in the principles of the Church of England; and we would fear that the operation of the proposed system would be to deprive these children of the advantage they now enjoy, and to remove such schools from under the control of the parochial Clergy.

Because, that we cannot forget the solemn vow

taken by us at receiving priest's orders, that, by the assistance of God, "we will banish and drive away all erroneous and strange doctrines;" and we therefore shrink from being connected with a system which encourages the inculcation of doctrines and practices that are declared by our Church to be "fond things repugnant to the word of God, and such as cannot be taught without arrogancy and impiety," and which sanctions the use of catechisms, of which we would say, in the words of the Lord Primate in his Letter to the Commissioners of Education Inquiry, "as long as they continue to be privately inculcated, all other lessons they" (the children) "may receive, will teach them dissimulation rather than cordial good feeling."

And, finally, because, instead of the Clergy of the National Church being recognised in the system as the proper and legitimate guardians of national education, they are introduced but as the coadjutors of the Roman Catholic Clergy, and are deprived of the control over the children even of their Protestant parishioners.

We beg most humbly to refer your Grace, in confirmation of the statements we have made, and the opinions we have expressed, to the Reports of the various Societies employed in scriptural education, to the evidence given on oath before the Commissioners of Education Inquiry, and to the letter of his Grace the Lord Primate to the same Commissioners, printed in their Ninth Report. Strengthened by such authority, we feel emboldened to say, that we cannot in conscience cooperate with the plan for National Education projected

by the Government, and to be carried into effect by the Board of which your Grace is a member; that while, even in the trial of an experiment for the production of civil union, we would willingly sacrifice every thing, (except what involves a desertion of what we conscientiously believe to be our principles as Protestants,) and deprecate the use of any means for spreading truth but those of moral suasion, we cannot lend our aid to a system which recognises the inculcation of error against which we have protested, and limits the circulation of the Scriptures which "are able to make wise unto salvation;"—we cannot willingly consent to restrict the use of the Bible in the education of Protestants; nor to hand over the Roman Catholic portion of our flocks to the operation of principles which must result to them in hopeless ignorance.

Your Grace's Clergy do not presume to impugn the motives which have influenced the conduct of our rulers; far less to dictate to your Grace. We but seek to explain the principles on which we feel bound conscientiously to act; and we trust that this candid explanation, upon our part, will not appear inconsistent with the sincere respect we entertain for your Grace individually,—with the anxious desire we have to cooperate with your Grace in every object connected with the interests of the Church,—or with the sense we entertain of the canonical obedience due from us to our ecclesiastical superiors.

In conclusion, we would beg, with great sincerity, to congratulate your Grace on your accession to your

present elevated and influential station, and to express our unfeigned wishes and prayers, that, under your Grace's protection and government, this portion of the United Church of England and Ireland may be blessed with an abundant outpouring of the Spirit of God, and may become a fertile source of spiritual blessings to the population of our land.

Signed by desire of the Clergy of the Arch-Diocese* of Dublin and Diocese of Glandelough,

JOHN TORRENS,
Archdeacon of Dublin.

* This Address was voted, of course, by a *majority* of the Clergy present; but I have ascertained that it was opposed by a very considerable minority, though they did not think it necessary to come to a division. The Address from the Clergy of Derry also, did not, as I was informed, by any means express the sentiments of all those belonging to the diocese.

MEMORIAL

OF

THE CLERGY OF THE DIOCESE OF DERRY TO HIS GRACE THE LORD ARCHBISHOP OF DUBLIN.

We, the undersigned Clergy of the Diocese of Derry, having seen with deep and painful concern the contemplated plan of National Education for Ireland, consider it a paramount duty respectfully to bring before your Grace, as the representative of the Church of Ireland in the new Board of Education, the aspect under which that plan presents itself to us. Under the most calm and deliberate view of that plan, we feel bound to declare, that we would consider it as a compromise of principle and conscience, as inconsistent with the reverence which we bear towards the oracles of God, as an abandonment of our ministerial faithfulness, and a breach of that true Christian love and honour which is due from us to your Grace's station in the Church's ministries, if we did not raise our voice at this perilous crisis, solemnly to protest

to your Grace, and through you to the Government and the Nation, against the system proposed.

Independent of all objections to the subordinate details of the education measure, the ground of our protest is simple and plain: as ministers of God's word, we cannot, we dare not become a party to any system of parochial instruction, in which the Bible, as given by the Spirit of God through the prophets and the apostles, is to be considered as a book outlawed and exiled for its dangerous tendencies to the commonwealth, and in which its place is to be supplied by partial selections, framed at the discretion, and accommodated to the expediency or the worldly policy of men.

We claim the Bible, as the essential part of the national education of a Christian people in a Christian land; we claim it, because it is the great Christian basis of moral and religious education,* and because without an education so based, we much doubt the value of any education whatever; we claim the Bible for our schools, because it is the birthright of every Christian—the Christian's great charter of truth and hope; and, finally, we claim it, because, most happily, the Bible is the only common ground on which those who widely differ in other respects can meet together and learn to know and serve God as brethren.

* It seems to have been forgotten—1st, that *our* authorized version of the Scriptures is *not* authorized by the Church of Rome: 2dly, that their Bible includes the Apocrypha: and 3dly, that they do not permit the indiscriminate perusal of the Scriptures by children: so that as a "basis of religious and moral education," the Bible is *not* a "common ground."

In expressing to your Grace our sentiments thus honestly, we disclaim every thing tending even in appearance to disrespect or disobedience to those who are placed in authority over us: as we fear God, so would we honour the King and those who rule under him. But at such a time we feel it to be our solemn duty to our God, to our King, and to our country, thus plainly to declare the convictions of our conscience, of our understandings and experience—convictions which will not suffer us to become participators in any system for depreciating, mutilating, or trifling with the Word of God—with that Word, which, in its largeness and extent, must one day judge those who teach, and those who rule, as well as those who learn, and those who obey.

We have the honour to be,
Your Grace's dutiful and
obedient Servants.

[*Here follow the Signatures.*]

OBSERVATIONS OF THE BISHOPS,

&c. &c.

The undersigned Archbishops and Bishops of the United Church of England and Ireland, having taken into their consideration, with a solicitude due to the importance of the subject, the system of national education, recently proposed by His Majesty's government for adoption in Ireland, submit to the Clergy of their respective dioceses the following observations with regard to it. They trust that in withholding their concurrence from this system, they will not be suspected of perverse opposition to government, in its endeavours to promote general instruction, and to heal the wounds occasioned by party and religious distinctions.

They are deeply sensible that the present demoralized state of a great portion of the Irish poor, and the disorders and outrages consequent upon it, are to be mainly attributed to the want of a suitable training of youth, and to ignorance of the pure principles of God's holy word, which prescribes the only just rule of duty towards God and towards man, and imposes the only effectual restraint upon those wild passions which lead to the violation of

it. They are, moreover, fully aware of the advantages attendant upon the instruction of children of different religious persuasions in one common school, since it may be expected that the kindly feelings generated by means of such an association in childhood and youth, will spread their influence over the subsequent periods of human life.

It is, therefore, with unfeigned regret, that they are constrained to express their deliberate and conscientious persuasion, that the proposed plan of national education, instead of producing these salutary and much-to-be-desired effects, would tend rather to embitter existing animosities, by marking more distinctly the difference of Creed in the public school, and by pointedly excluding, as a common source of instruction, that Volume which authoritatively inculcates, and by the most awful sanctions, universal charity, mutual forbearance, and the cultivation of order and peace.

They do not deny that selections from the Scriptures, not to the exclusion, but by way of facilitating the knowledge of the Bible itself, may be usefully employed in the instruction of youth: such selections have been constantly made use of in the schools under their superintendence; but dispassionately viewing the wide and essential difference between the United Church and that of Rome, and bearing in mind the pretensions to exclusive sovereignty put forth by the latter,—taught, moreover, by the failure of a former attempt at instruction in common, in which concession on the part of the United Church proceeded to the very verge of what was

allowable, and as some thought, even beyond what prudence suggested, where at any rate, the concessions made could be justified only by the ardent desire of concord; and when, instead of promoting this end, they served but to encourage increasing demands and to call forth unreasonable objections; when instead of scriptural selections, professing to form part of the Word of God, a Treatise was put forth which might have been read by the scholars without any knowledge of the existence of such a book as the Bible, or without the suspicion that revealed truth was to be derived through any other channel than that of the Roman Catholic priesthood;—these things considered, the undersigned prelates cannot too strongly express their conviction that no selection of Scripture will be agreed to by the Roman Catholic hierarchy, which shall exhibit to the youthful mind a correct standard of faith and practice, and set forth the right of every man to possess, and inculcate the duty of every man devoutly to read and examine the Scriptures; not indeed to the superseding of pastoral instruction, but in spite of the usurped authority of ecclesiastical rulers. They further state, that they do not affect to conceal their grief at beholding the Clergy of the Established Church deprived of the trust committed to their hands by the legislature—of superintending national education;—a trust which they have not failed to execute with a fidelity and zeal pronounced to be most exemplary, on every inquiry made into the discharge of their duty, and at the same time with a prudence and moderation most particularly required in the divided state of religious

opinion in Ireland. Nor are they at all consoled in seeing this superintendence in matters of national education, taken from themselves for the purpose of being vested in a Board composed of persons of such conflicting religious opinions that it is impossible to conceive an unity of operation, without some surrender or suppression of important points of revealed truth. They by no means undervalue the patronage and aid of government in carrying on the work of public instruction; but they are content to forego this advantage, rather than to give their sanction to a system, which, in rigidly excluding the Scriptures from the common schools, would introduce in their place books of religious and literary instruction, in the choice of which they are permitted to exercise neither judgment nor control. They cannot conceal from themselves that such a measure, in the same proportion that it tends to remove the Clergy of the Established Church from the high position in which they now stand, virtually transfers to the Roman Catholic priesthood that preference and preponderating influence which have been hitherto assigned to the purity and authority of religious truth, rather than to the numerical superiority of the members of any communion in a single part of the United Empire.

With these views, the undersigned Archbishops and Bishops, whilst they give just credit to the intentions of His Majesty's Government in bringing forward a plan of national education, cannot but regard that which has been proposed, as most inapplicable to the present state of Ireland; as subversive of those institutions for the

education of the poor, which, without giving just cause of offence to Roman Catholic prejudices, have produced great good, and which, if duly supported, would have unostentatiously gone on producing much more; as separating religious from literary instruction, which ought to proceed hand in hand together; as depriving Roman Catholics of the Scriptures, which it appears from undoubted documents they are every day becoming more anxious of obtaining; and as transferring from the national Clergy all superintendence over the national education, of which they are the appointed guardians.

In conclusion, therefore, they recommend to the Clergy of their respective dioceses, to endeavour to support the Schools now under their management, by such means as they may themselves possess, and with such assistance as they may be able to procure, trusting in the blessing of Divine Providence on their humble endeavours to work unmixed good, even if it should be within a more confined circle, rather than to engage in the support of a system which is exposed to so many just objections, and which, as it should seem, cannot be carried into effect so as to secure the cooperation of the Roman Catholic Clergy, without a compromise of Protestant principles, and without retarding the progress of Scripture knowledge, which is now making large advances in Ireland.

February 23, 1832.

This paper was signed by a large proportion of the Irish Prelates. Of the apprehensions expressed in this, and in the preceding Address, the greater part—among others, the "conviction that no selections of Scripture that shall exhibit a correct standard of faith and practice will be agreed to by the Roman Catholic Hierarchy"—have by no means been realized in the subsequent experience of four years. To suppose that this circumstance is matter of mortification and disappointment, rather than of congratulation to those who expressed such apprehensions, would be to impute to them an indifference to the national welfare, and an insincerity in their professions of solicitude for the furtherance of good education, such as it would be most unjust and uncharitable hastily to attribute to any one. And it would be equally unjust towards us, to suppose that we exult in ungenerous triumph at the refutation which experience has afforded of unfavourable predictions. Those, indeed, whose opposition to the system may have been merely the result of political or personal hostility against the members of some political party, I cannot but consider as unjustifiable. But many may have sincerely felt apprehensions which, though groundless, yet were not perhaps the result of hostile prejudices and ill-wishes. And again, it will often happen that apprehensions which eventually are not realized, may yet have been at the time far from unreasonable. No one, therefore, should incur blame for having conscientiously opposed any system on the ground of his having entertained apprehensions which subsequent

experience has not confirmed; provided he has the candour to retract what has been proved an erroneous anticipation, and does not persevere in an opposition professedly founded on reasons which are now done away.

I, for one, am free to confess that I did not, at one time, anticipate results so satisfactory as have taken place; though I thought myself bound to make the trial. In particular, I had not dared to flatter myself that so large a portion of Scripture would have found admission into the system of daily *common* instruction in the schools; though I still thought that if even nothing but reading were taught during school-hours on four or five days of the week, this would be far preferable — as enabling all that were so disposed, to receive religious instruction on the other days—to the total and final exclusion of a large portion of the population from all chance of ever perusing the Scriptures, by leaving them unable to read at all. The result, however, has far surpassed my most sanguine expectations.

I have only to add, in this place, that it is gratifying to observe the sentiments expressed in the above papers, deprecating "the use of any means for spreading truth but those of moral suasion,"— recognising "the advantages attendant on the instruction of children of different religious persuasions in one common school:" and the "utility of employing selections from the Scriptures in the instruction of youth," and "attributing the present demoralized state of a great

portion of the Irish poor, to ignorance." These and similar sentiments, as far as they are sincerely and steadily brought into practice now, will secure the most desirable results to a system which even a short and imperfect trial has shown to be not open to the objections at first alleged.

THE COMMISSIONERS appointed for administering the Funds placed at the disposal of his Excellency the LORD LIEUTENANT, for the Education of the Poor of Ireland, are ready to receive Applications for Aid towards the building and fitting-up of Schools, the paying of Teachers, and the obtaining of Books and School Requisites, on the following conditions:

I.—They will require that Local Funds be raised:

1st. For the Annual Repair of the School House and Furniture.

2dly. Towards a permanent Salary for the Teacher; the amount of such Salary, in each case, to be settled with the approbation of the Commissioners.

3dly. For the Purchase of Books and School Requisites, at half price.

II.—Where aid is sought from the Commissioners, for building a School House, they will require that, at least, one-third of the estimated expense be locally contributed: that a site for building, to be approved of by the Commissioners, be secured for the purpose: and that the School House, when finished, be vested in Trustees, to be also approved of by them.

III.—They will require, that the Schools be kept open for a certain number of hours, on four or on five days of the week, at the discretion of the Commissioners, for Moral and Literary Education only; and that the remaining one or two days in the week be set apart for giving, separately, such Religious Education to the Children as may be approved of by the Clergy of their respective persuasions. They will also permit and encourage the Clergy to give Religious Instruction either before or after the ordinary School-Hours, on the other days of the week.

IV.—They will require to have the entire control over all Books to be used in the Schools, whether in the combined Moral and Literary, or separate Religious Instruction; none to be employed in the former, except under the sanction of the Board, nor in the latter, but with the approbation of those Members of the Board who are of the same Religious persuasion with the Children for whose use they are intended.

Although it is not designed to exclude from the list of Books for the combined instruction such portions of Sacred History, or of religious and moral teaching, as may be approved of by the entire Board; it is to be understood, that the use of such Books is by no means intended to constitute a perfect and sufficient Religious Education, or to supersede the necessity of separate religious instruction on the days set apart for that purpose.

V.—They will require that in all Schools a Register be kept, in which shall be entered the attendance or non-attendance of each Child on Divine Worship on Sundays.*

VI.—They will allow to the individuals or bodies, applying for aid, the appointment of their Teachers, subject to the following restrictions and regulations:

1st. All Teachers, (except of Schools now existing, and which shall be approved of by the Board,) shall have received previous instruction in a Model-School in Dublin, to be sanctioned by the Board, and shall also have obtained from the Board testimonials of good conduct and general fitness.

2dly. All Teachers shall be liable to be fined, suspended, or removed, when the Commissioners deem it necessary.

VII.—The Commissioners, by themselves, or their Inspectors, to be allowed to visit and examine the Schools whenever they think fit.

VIII.—They will particularly require that the principles of the following Lesson be strictly inculcated in all Schools approved of by them, and that the Lesson

* This regulation having afforded an opening for misconstruction, was shortly afterwards cancelled.

itself be printed, and copies of it on pasteboard be hung up in each school:

Christians should endeavour, as the Apostle Paul commands them, to "live peaceably with all men;" (Romans, ch. xii. ver. 18,) even with those of a different religious persuasion.

Our Saviour Christ commanded his Disciples to "love one another." He taught them to love even their enemies, to bless those that cursed them, and to pray for those who persecuted them. He himself prayed for his murderers.

Many men hold erroneous doctrines; but we ought not to hate or persecute them. We ought to seek for the truth, and to hold fast what we are convinced is the truth; but not to treat harshly those who are in error. Jesus Christ did not intend his religion to be forced on men by violent means. He would not allow his Disciples to fight for him.

If any persons treat us unkindly, we must not do the same to them; for Christ and his Apostles have taught us not to return evil for evil. If we would obey Christ, we must do to others, not as they do to us, but as we should wish them to do to us.

Quarrelling with our neighbours and abusing them, is not the way to convince them that we are in the right, and they in the wrong. It is more likely to convince them that we have not a Christian spirit.

We ought to show ourselves followers of Christ, who, "when he was reviled, reviled not again," (1 Pet. ch. ii. ver. 23,) by behaving gently and kindly to every one.

As one of the main objects of His Majesty's Government is to unite in one System, Children of different Creeds, and as much must depend upon the cooperation of the resident Clergy, the Board will look with peculiar favour upon applications proceeding, either from,

1st. A Protestant Clergyman and Roman Catholic Clergyman conjointly.

2dly. A Clergyman of the one denomination, and a certain number of Laymen of the other.

3dly. Laymen of both denominations.

All Letters or Applications to the Commissioners, to be addressed to them, under cover, to the "CHIEF SECRETARY, DUBLIN CASTLE," marked in the corner with the word "EDUCATION."

OFFICE OF EDUCATION,
No. 30, *Upper Merrion-street.*

Note to Page 159.

It may be necessary to apprise some of my readers that the plan of the Schools, under the Kildare-place Society, differs in little or nothing from that pursued in the National Schools, except in requiring that a copy of the whole Bible, or, at least, of the New Testament (either in the authorized, or in the Douay version) shall be kept in each School, and that a portion of this, at the discretion of the master, or of the patrons, shall be read aloud every day during School hours.

The Masters and Mistresses may be either Roman Catholics or Protestants. No rule of the Society enforces *attention* on the part of the children to what is read; or examination in the *matter* of it; or *explanations* of the sense of the words; or prescribes either the *continuous* reading, on consecutive days, of any one book, or any *fixed portions* to be selected. No rule is violated by the practice (which, I understand, has been actually found to exist in some instances) of reading the same single passage over and over again, every day, from one year's end to another.

The reader will easily perceive, therefore, that nine-tenths of the declamation which has been poured forth (in most instances, by advocates of the Kildare-place system) against the National Schools, applies, to say the least, just as much to the one as to the other. I mean,

for instance, all the declamation about the "*whole* Bible,"—against "selections" from Scripture,—entrusting Roman Catholic masters with the education of children,—the substitution of any other translation for the "authorized;" and much more of the same kind.

It is only necessary to add, since the Public have lately been deluded by representations of the number of Kildare-place Schools in Ireland, as amounting to, I believe, upwards of 1200, and as likely, if supported, to suffice for the wants of the people, that the following appears, from the Report of the Commissioners of Public Instruction, to be the correct statement; viz. In the Province of Armagh, 195; Dublin, 17; Cashel, 15; Tuam, 8; total, 235 Schools on the plan of the Kildare-place Society; of which, about four-fifths are confined to the comparatively Protestant population of Ulster.

The following is an extract from a letter, addressed by the National-Education-Board, in January, 1835, to Sir H. Hardinge, the Secretary for Ireland, in answer to inquiries officially made by him.

"The intention of his Majesty's Government to "appoint the present Board of Education was announced "in the House of Commons on the 9th of September, "1831, by Mr. Stanley. He referred to the Reports of "the Commissioners and Committees already mentioned, "and pointed out the objections to the Kildare-place "Society. It was a voluntary association, not respon-"sible to the Government, nor under its control. It "required the Testament to be read in the several "Schools without note or comment. This rule was

" contrary to the principles of the Roman Catholic " church; the Society was, therefore, opposed by the " Roman Catholics, and the bulk of the Schools was in " the Protestant province of Ulster. There were 1021 " Schools in Ulster, and only 600 in the other three " provinces. The number of Roman Catholics in the " Schools was quite disproportioned to their amount " in the general population of the country. In the " present year, there were trained in the Model School " 204 teachers; of these, only 33 were Roman Catholics, " the rest being Protestants. He had been of opinion " that the Society had not been of a proselytising " character, but the last Report of the Society would " make him (Mr. Stanley) hesitate in asserting that such " was the fact. He agreed with the Reports of the " Commissioners and the Committees, and stated that a " Board should be appointed upon the plan proposed by " the Committee of the House of Commons in 1828, to " carry into effect the system recommended by it."

AN APPEAL

IN BEHALF OF

THE ASSOCIATION INCORPORATED FOR DISCOUNTENANCING VICE, &c.

In furtherance of the object set forth in the following "Appeal," sermons were delivered (for the most part, on the same day,) in nearly all the churches in this diocese. The one subjoined was delivered at St. Bridget's Church, in Dublin, on the 15th of November, 1835.

I take this opportunity of mentioning that the present Lord Lieutenant, and his Excellency's predecessor, the Earl of Haddington, each, on accepting the office of President, bestowed a donation on the Association. I notice this circumstance, however, merely as evincing the good-will of their Excellencies, but not as implying any different disposition in their predecessors, under whom (and probably by their recommendations) considerable grants of public money had been made to the Institution.

I am bound to mention, also, that since this Appeal was published, the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge has bestowed on the Association a liberal grant of books.

AN APPEAL,

&c. &c.

The Association for Discountenancing Vice and Promoting the Knowledge and Practice of the Christian Religion, was founded in the year 1792, by a few private individuals in Dublin. Its usefulness having been fully proved, it was incorporated by Act of Parliament in the year 1800; and it now includes among its members all the prelates, and upwards of 1,400 Clergymen, besides several of the Laity most distinguished for moral worth and influence in the country.

The Association was the earliest, and has been one of the most efficient institutions employed in awakening attention to religion in Ireland, especially among the members of the Established Church. It suggested the plan and prepared the way for many of those religious societies which have since been established, and are now in operation in this country. And, without any feeling of rivalry or jealousy towards them, the Association, while it claims precedence as the oldest of them all, still

occupies a post of peculiar advantage and importance, as the only Society intimately connected with the Established Church, sanctioned by her prelates, regulating its proceedings in strict accordance with her discipline, and seeking especially the benefit of her members.

It would be impossible, in this brief account, to detail the various plans that have been adopted, at different times, by this Society, as opportunities offered. The principal objects to which its operations are at present directed are the following:—

I. The distribution of the Holy Scriptures, the Book of Common Prayer, and religious Tracts.
II. The encouragement of Catechetical Instruction.
III. The support of Schools.

1. *This Society was the first in Ireland to put into the hands of the poor the inestimable treasure of the Word of God.* It still continues to furnish its members with copies of the Holy Scriptures at very reduced prices for distribution: and has been the means of putting into circulation, since its commencement, 154,760 Bibles, and 284,422 Testaments.

The spiritual improvement of the poorer members of the Established Church being one of the chief objects which the Association has had in view, the distribution of *the Book of Common Prayer* at a very cheap rate has occupied a large share of its attention. Since the formation of the Society, 284,825 Prayer-books have been sold, or distributed gratuitously.

Another most useful means of diffusing Christian

knowledge employed by the Association has been the circulation of *Religious Tracts*, adapted to the capacities of the unlearned. These publications have been principally of two kinds. The one consisting of short and plain treatises in defence of Christianity against the attacks and objections of Infidels:—a class of works particularly called for at the time the Society was formed, and still greatly needed. The other consisting of familiar explanations of the rites and formularies of the Established Church, calculated to make all its members intelligently acquainted with their meaning and use; so that their devotions might be a reasonable service, and their attachment to its constitution the result of an enlightened perception of its superiority to all others—thereby fortifying their minds against the delusions of enthusiasm, and ignorant innovations in religion. The Association has likewise distributed several Tracts of a more lively and interesting character, conveying instruction in amusing narratives; especially Mrs. Hannah More's cheap Repository Tracts, which were communicated to the Association by their distinguished authoress on her first publishing them. From the time it was formed, up to the present, this Society has put in circulation 1,416,616 Tracts.

2. The next great object which has occupied the attention of the Society is the promotion of Catechetical Instruction. The Association was the means of reviving this mode of instruction in Ireland. It has laboured unremittingly in this cause, judging it to be of the very highest importance. And it is *the only Society which*

devotes attention to this subject. Under the name of catechetical teaching is not meant merely hearing children repeat the answers in the Church Catechism, but examining them and exercising their minds on appointed portions of the Liturgy and of the Scriptures suited to their age. By this means those who are too young and inattentive to derive profit from a continuous discourse delivered from the pulpit, are made well acquainted with the first principles of the oracles of God; their minds are accustomed to search and inquire into the truths set before them; and the Clergyman is brought personally in contact with each individual of his flock as his spiritual instructor, at a time of life when the heart is susceptible of lasting impressions. By frequently calling the attention of the Clergy to the value of this method of communicating religious knowledge—by supplying hints for practising it efficiently—and by distributing premiums of books to the young persons who have been most diligent in their attendance, and have made the greatest proficiency, the Association has extended and encouraged this good work, and has been an incalculable blessing to the country. Through the liberality of the venerable Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, the Association is enabled still to carry on its system of catechetical premiums. And every parish minister in Ireland is enabled, if he pleases, to give rewards to the children under his instruction. Within the last year 11,586 children were publicly examined, and 2,234 premiums were bestowed.

3. Another most important object which has engaged

the anxious care of the Association, is the improvement of education generally in the schools for the lower orders. Having ascertained by accurate inquiry at the close of the last century, the state of education in every diocese in Ireland, the Society determined on extending and assisting parochial day schools. The regulations laid down for these schools are as follows:—A substantial house must be built or procured, (towards the building of which the Association contributes one-third,) and at least an acre of land must be annexed for the use of the master: the property of both to be vested in the hands of the minister and churchwardens of the parish:—The Clergyman is to superintend and have the entire control over the school:—The master and mistress must be members of the Established Church:—The Scriptures must be read by all who have made suitable proficiency:—The Church Catechism must be taught to the members of the Establishment:—None must be excluded on account of inability to pay:—And no books of a controversial kind, nor such as the Association disapproves of, must be admitted.

In order to secure a compliance with these rules the Society calls for a Report every half-year from the Clergyman of the parish, in which he is to state the number of visits he has paid to the School during the six preceding months,—the average number of children in daily attendance,—the names of all the books used by them,—and the receipts and expenditure of the income belonging to the school. He is to certify also as to the conduct of the teachers,—the progress of the children,

particularly the progress in religious knowledge of the children of the Established Church, and whether it is creditable to the master and mistress. If the Report be favourable in all these respects, a small salary is paid by the Association to the teachers.

Thus while the Society takes especial care of the children of the poorer members of the Established Church, its Schools are open to children of every denomination, without their being required to receive any of the peculiar religious instruction which the managers of the Society feel it to be their duty to provide for the youthful members of their own Church.

This was the first plan of general education ever tried in Ireland. Having been submitted to Parliament in 1803, a grant of money was voted for the purpose of establishing schools on this system. The success which attended the efforts of the Association was most encouraging. No charge of tampering with the religion of the children of any sect has ever been made against this Society. It has always openly avowed its principles, and consistently acted on them; and thus avoided all reproach of insincerity. Government aid was afforded in an increasing proportion every year, according as the schools were extended throughout the country, until the year 1830, when it was unexpectedly diminished: and in the commencement of 1832, it was altogether withdrawn. In consequence of this diminution of its funds, the Association was obliged to reduce the salaries allowed to the teachers, and to withdraw all pecuniary assistance wherever the local patrons were able to support their

Schools. *The Society is now entirely dependent on voluntary contributions for its support.* The Schools which it aids are such as are unable to maintain themselves without its assistance. Of these there are 232, containing 8953 Protestants, and 4003 Roman Catholics. And the Association is reluctantly obliged, from want of funds, frequently to refuse applications from destitute parts of the country to aid in establishing new schools.

In the appropriation of the funds entrusted to the Society, the strictest economy is observed; and all the office expenses have been placed on the lowest scale consistent with the efficient maintenance of the Society.

The proceedings of the Association have been always conducted in the most unostentatious manner. It has worked, as much as possible, silently and without seeking for popular applause; but not on that account the less effectively. Now, however, that the Society is compelled either to abandon its labours or publicly to solicit aid, it makes its appeal to all who feel an interest in the spiritual improvement of Ireland, and especially to those who have at heart the welfare of the poorer members of the Established Church, and entreats them to come forward in its behalf.

The Society is already involved in debt; and unless the friends of religion speedily and generously assist it, 232 Schools, containing more than 12,000 children, will be deprived of their chief support—the great stimulus and encouragement given to Catechetical Instruction be withdrawn—and the Established Church, when it can

least spare a friend, lose a faithful auxiliary, that for forty-three years has laboured to promote the spiritual interests of her members. *Hitherto the majority of the subscribers to the Association have been the Irish Clergy:* from them, in their present harassed condition, increased contributions cannot be expected. The lay members of the Church, who have never yet been zealously applied to in a good cause in vain, are solicited now to contribute to a Society which has at heart the promotion of true religion in the country, and has attained to long experience in the best modes of effecting this desirable object,—which in doctrine studies to show "uncorruptness, gravity, sincerity," and in practice to "follow righteousness, faith, charity, peace, with them that call on the Lord out of a pure heart." The very existence of the Society depends on the success of this Appeal.

November, 1835.

Subscriptions will be received by the Rev. Alexander Irwin, Assistant-Secretary and Sub-Treasurer, 104, Grafton-street, Dublin; and by Messrs. Hoare and Co., Bankers, London.

SERMON

IN BEHALF OF THE ASSOCIATION.

ROMANS XII. 5.

We being many are one body in Christ.

It was often remarked by eminent heathen writers, long before the preaching of the gospel, that man is by nature a social being; that we are led by a kind of instinct, not only, like many of the lower animals, to dwell together, but also to combine,—cooperate,—associate in communities, and afford mutual assistance to each other in furthering some common objects. And it is not, they observe, merely from the desire of attaining such objects as we could not attain *without* that mutual aid, that we are originally led, on calculations of expediency,

thus to combine together, but from an instinctive tendency towards forming communities; of which tendency we afterwards avail ourselves in lending our joint efforts towards some desirable object.

"If a man," says one of the most eminent of these writers,* "could, by means of a magic wand such as we read of in fables, command all the necessaries and all the enjoyments of solitary life, he would still feel a craving after the social union; for men," he says, "like bees, are drawn together by a natural associating principle, and not originally from a mere view to the advantages which result from their union." Accordingly we find men in all ages and countries, delighting to form,—besides the political community of each state, — various kinds of social combinations for various purposes, whether useful, indifferent, or even vicious; and hardly any one chooses to pursue any kind of object by himself, rather than in conjunction with others, even when their cooperation with him is not necessary.

* Cicero de Officiis.

Now, as there is nothing in the character of man which our religion tends to eradicate or suppress, except so far as it is vicious and corrupt, so, the great Author of our Faith took advantage especially of the *social* principle in our nature, and directed it towards the furthering of the great objects of his religion. He did not merely lay down certain doctrines for each man to believe, and certain rules for each man to observe, independently of other believers; but He was careful to establish among them a system of cooperation, and a principle of mutual attachment. Christianity is not a solitary religion. Hermits living secluded in solitary cells, or withdrawn from the haunts of men into unfrequented deserts, can find no sort of countenance for their practice, either in the teaching, or in the examples, of Christ and his immediate followers. Nor is this all: not only are Christians neither encouraged nor permitted to *renounce* society in general, but they are enjoined to *form* social unions of their own; to combine together *as* Christians; to cooperate with a view to Christian objects; and to cultivate a brotherly regard for their fellow-Christians.

That brotherly regard was not indeed designed to narrow the limits of general good-will towards men, to shut up the hearts of Christians against their fellow-creatures, and to stand in the place of general benevolence; but it is plain that it was considered by Christ and his Apostles as a distinct duty from that. When He said to his disciples, "A new commandment I give unto you, that ye love one another," He cannot properly be understood as recommending general benevolence; since *that* commandment, though undoubtedly a divine, could not properly have been described as a *new* one. For besides that He had already taught them to consider every man as a neighbour to whom they could do a service, and had exhorted them to love even their enemies; * besides this, even the heathen moralists, however imperfectly they practised the duty of general benevolence, were by no means ignorant of it. In his "New Commandment," he evidently had in view the mutual love of Christians as such. And so also the Apostles, when they speak of brotherly

* Luke x.

love (philadelphia) and exhort us to "*add* to brotherly kindness, charity"—"to honour all men, and love the brotherhood"—"to do good to all men, and especially to those that are of the *household* of *faith*"—are evidently drawing a marked distinction between the two virtues, of general philanthropy, and the spirit of Christian brotherhood, and are at the same time alluding to the social union existing in those Christian communities, which, we know, existed in their times, and were founded by themselves. All these communities — the early Christian churches—though independent of one another, and having each its own governors, who claimed no authority except in their own respective churches, all these are perpetually reminded by the Apostles not only of the bond of union which united the members of each of these distinct societies, but also of that fellowship or "communion" * of saints which bound together as brethren all the followers of their one common Master, Christ; the bond of a

* Κοινωνία is sometimes rendered "communion," sometimes "fellowship."

common faith and a common hope, and the mutual charity that should accompany these. Indeed, the social duty of Christians, as such, is so earnestly dwelt on, and set forth in so many different points of view by our Lord and his Apostles, that they seem plainly to have considered this as one of the principal points in the religion. It is to Christians, not singly but collectively, that some of the most eminent and remarkable of the gospel blessings are promised. We are well assured, indeed, that Christ will "come unto a man that loveth Him and keepeth his sayings, and will make his abode with him," by his Spirit; and that he who "enters into his closet, and prays to his Father, who seeth in secret," will be accepted: but an especial promise is made to the *joint* supplications of a Christian *assembly;* for "wheresoever," says our Lord, "two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst of them." Christians, again, are called (as in the passage taken as the text) the "body of Christ,"—"every one members one of another;" they are called the "temple of the Holy Ghost which dwelleth in them;"—

not *separately*, the *temples*, but collectively, the *Temple*. Individual Christians are spoken of as "living stones" of this Temple; and are exhorted accordingly to "build up" or edify one another; and so frequently do the Apostles use this particular kind of metaphorical expression, that the very purpose for which they introduced it, has been for that very cause, in a great measure, lost sight of, and the expressions themselves have thus, through long familiarity, lost great part of their force. The words "edify" and "edification" are continually employed in the present day to denote Christian instruction and improvement, without the thought even occurring to many persons that in their original sense they signify *building*. The words, indeed, are now so totally disused, among us, in that original sense, that many Christians, I believe, are not even aware that "edifying" means, literally, building up, or that it has any connexion with the word "edifice."*

* Accordingly, it has been noticed as a *novelty* that in the works of Dr. Hinds ("The Three Temples,") and in mine (Sermons ii. iii. iv.) so much stress has been laid on this point. But that this—so called—novelty, is, like many

In all this we see marks of that harmonious agreement among the several works of God, of which we shall see the more, the more closely we examine them. We see that our religion came from Him who "knew what was in man" —from Him who is the Maker of man. We see the gospel turning to its own gracious purposes all the tendencies of human nature that are not in themselves evil;—not seeking to stop the current of those dispositions which form a part of our original constitution, but directing them into their proper channel.

This fitness of the gospel for man, — this adaptation of it to the wants of our nature, and to the tendencies of the better portion of it,—is in no point more conspicuous than in the one I have now been speaking of,—the social,—combining, — cooperating, — and, as it may be termed, fraternal principle in man's nature. Christians are required, as such, to combine in Christian communities,—not to "forsake the assembling of themselves together," for the

others, only a *return* to what was once common and familiar, is attested by the monuments, as it were, of this once-familiar use, preserved in our language.

purpose of joint worship,—to promote the spiritual improvement of each other,—their mutual "edification," as the Apostles express it;—and besides general benevolence towards their *fellow-creatures*, to cherish a brotherly regard towards the *fellow-members* of the body of Christ. This, I say, is *required* of Christians: but that it is no strange and unnatural requisition,—that it is perfectly in accordance with the original disposition of man, is plain; not only from the tendency we see in all descriptions of men to form societies for other purposes, unconnected with religion, but also from this, that those most earnestly devoted to the cause of their religion may generally be found *spontaneously* combining themselves in societies for the accomplishment of some specific objects connected with that cause;—uniting in voluntary associations (whether wisely or unwisely constituted) over and above that union for Christian purposes generally, which they are strictly *bound* to maintain as members of a Christian church.

One of the societies which have been thus formed by Christians of their own accord, for

Christian purposes, is that Association for which your aid is this day solicited. In its objects, generally stated, it agrees very nearly with those societies which the Apostles established under Divine direction: for a *Christian church* might properly be styled "an Association for discountenancing vice, and for promoting the knowledge and practice of the Christian religion:" but the particular regulations of this, our Association, are framed with a view to accomplish some particular objects more effectually than could be done by such a society as a church; and at the same time to keep clear of any interference with the Church, and of any tendency to withdraw its members from their allegiance to the Church, or make the one society either a substitute for the other or a rival. Our Association, accordingly, does not provide ministers of the gospel, but takes measures to facilitate their labour, and to render it more effectual; by distributing Bibles and other books of religious instruction, and by affording assistance in various ways towards the religious education of children. It does not send forth labourers into the Lord's vineyard, but provides, as it

were, implements for their labour, and helps to prepare the soil for the cultivation. And thus it becomes a most important auxiliary to the Church ;—to the Church, I mean, considered not as to its temporal prosperity and political establishment, but as a spiritual society, and in reference to the great spiritual purposes for which churches were originally founded. Some such auxiliary, indeed, seems indispensably necessary to give full efficiency to the labours of Christian ministers: for no one who is even tolerably instructed in the religion of the gospel can doubt that the most assiduous toil of the ablest and most devoted minister will succeed but to a very limited extent, and in a very imperfect degree, among those who do not read, or are not enabled to read profitably ;—who are unprovided with books,—strangers to the Scriptures, except such portions as they may hear read to them,—or not trained in early youth to the knowledge of the first rudiments of Christianity. And it must be equally beyond a doubt that a very large and important portion of our fellow-Christians—the great majority of the poorer classes—must be left without those

advantages which are so essential to their well-being as Christians, unless assistance is afforded them by such as are able to contribute;—unless the pecuniary cost of those advantages,—trifling as it is in comparison of the benefit conferred,—be in part borne by their Christian brethren.

Deeply impressed as I have always been with the importance of such objects as the Association purposes, and having long been a member of a kindred society in England, I made it a point to inquire, as soon as my present situation called my attention to it, into the character and pretensions of this institution. And I found it to have been so conducted,—to have so acted up to its title, in "discountenancing vice and promoting the knowledge and practice of the Christian religion,"—as to entitle it to my warmest support. And when I say that, from that moment to the present, no efforts of mine, of any kind, have been wanting by which it could be maintained and strengthened, I am far from putting forward this as a boast of something beyond the strict requisitions of duty. On the contrary, I cannot understand how any member of our Church, in this country, who is really in

earnest on the subject of his religion,—who is duly grateful to his Maker, Redeemer, and Sanctifier, for the advantages he himself possesses,—and who has any Christian feeling towards the fellow-members of the body of Christ,—I cannot understand, I say, how any such person, whether minister or layman, can be indifferent,—can be otherwise than zealous,—in the cause of such an institution. When we find that,—looking to the distribution of books alone, besides the other, many and great objects that have been accomplished,—the Association has been the means of putting into circulation nearly 450,000 copies either of the New Testament or of the whole Bible, besides more than 280,000 Prayer-Books, and nearly a million and a half of useful tracts,—when this, I say, as well as all the other useful exertions of the Association are considered, we might suppose that nothing more could be needed to recommend it to the good-will and hearty cooperation of every sincere Christian among the members of our Church :—we might expect that such an institution would require only to be known and understood, in order to be heartily and actively

supported;—that its members, both among the clergy and the laity, would be numerous and zealous, and that those who could not become actual members, would yet not be satisfied to be indifferent lookers-on, but would be anxious to have some share, whether great or small, in so great and good a work;—in a work which, in fact, is the same with that which occupied our blessed Master,—"preaching the gospel to the poor:" for that we are, in fact, doing, when we help to place in the hands and in the hearts of our poorer brethren now, the words which the poor in his days heard from his own lips, and from those of his messengers.

Such, I say, would be the expectations which a Christian stranger coming among us would probably be led to form, when he should have learnt what is the character, and what the claims, of this Association. And what would such a stranger think, my Christian friends, on being told that the society is on the verge of total extinction through the deficiency of its funds?—that though its revenues had always been economically dispensed, and its beneficent efforts of late greatly contracted, yet it is so

far from having the means of continuing even these limited efforts, that it is unable even to meet its existing engagements? If we should then endeavour to explain to him the circumstances which might account for such a lamentable change, — if we informed him that the Government grants by which the Association had been aided were for some years gradually diminished, and at length finally withdrawn, and that it is now wholly dependent on voluntary contributions,—he would probably remark that it was originally established, and for several years supported, by the voluntary efforts of private individuals alone; and he might ask what was become of that Christian benevolence and zealous liberality, which had once been effectual in instituting and carrying on a *new* experiment, and which are now called for only for the maintaining of an institution of *tried* utility. To this we should answer, that the calamitous circumstances in which a large portion of the Clergy are now placed, has put it out of their power to continue their former liberal support; and that the Clergy had always been a very great majority of the contributors. But might

he not reply, my Christian friends, by asking why this should ever have been the case?—by asking whether the lay-members of our communion regard themselves as not members of it at all;—whether they regard the Christian religion as exclusively the concern of the Clergy;—whether they consider them as the *only* persons bound to contribute, not only their strictly ministerial services,—not only their personal exertions, but their pecuniary aid also, towards the eternal benefit of their Christian brethren? He might ask you whether the body of Christ is represented in Scripture as consisting of the ministers alone, and whether all the members are not required, each in his own station, and according to the means which God has bestowed on him, to care for the welfare of all the other members; and he might ask you whether the Clergy alone, or you also, are in the habit of praying that "God's kingdom may come, and that his will may be done, as in heaven so also on earth;" and whether your exertions are not expected to keep pace with your petitions; whether it be not a solemn mockery of God to address to Him prayers which you will not hear yourselves?

And such a stranger, as I have been supposing, might also remark, that though this country is not so wealthy as some others, yet, limited as are the means of many individuals, in any case where they are truly in earnest, their numbers and their zealous efforts make up for the deficiency of individual wealth; and no cause in which they are heartily engaged is allowed to fail for want of pecuniary support. When, for instance, the object is to support and remunerate the public services rendered to a cause which they regard, whether rightly or wrongly, as a good and an important one, we find that even from the poorest classes contributions are raised, of such an amount as would not only relieve from embarrassment and threatened ruin the institution I am now pleading for, but would restore it to a state of active and effectual exertion.

Let it not be said then,—as far at least as you are concerned,—let it not be said that Christians of *our* Church are not in earnest in such a cause as this; that their exertions can only be called forth by the stimulus of a hostile contest with some opposed party, and that they own no close bond of union, except the bond of

a common enmity against adversaries. *These* recommendations, indeed, to favour and support, our Association wants, though it is wanting in no other. It keeps clear of hostile bitterness and party contention: it seeks to promote "peace on earth and good-will towards men:" its bond of union is love to our Redeemer, and love to our brethren for his sake, and zeal for the diffusion of his gospel, and the promotion of his glory; and the adversaries with which it wages war are irreligion, and ignorance, and vice. If you regard with apathetic indifference the labours of such a society as this, there is a strong presumption, at least, that the zeal in behalf of your religion, which you may, perhaps, be forward to manifest in a more contentious form on other occasions, is not pure *Christian* zeal, but is tainted with a large admixture (to say the least) of pride, anger, worldly ambition, and party spirit.

But if you contribute to this good work now, bountifully, according to your ability, and from pure and Christian motives, you will not merely be offering up on this one occasion such a sacrifice as God is well pleased with, but you will be

using the best means, through divine grace, towards purifying your motives and enlivening your zeal for his service, in your after-life : you will be taking a step towards " discountenancing vice" in yourself, and promoting your own " knowledge and practice of the Christian religion ;" — you will, perhaps, have brought yourself to value more highly, and to employ more effectually the means which Providence has placed within your own reach of advancing in your Christian course.

And now, my Christian friends, since we, who are here present, are fellow-members of the body of Christ, who has promised that " wheresoever two or three are gathered together in his name, He will be in the midst of them," it is fitting that we should at this time " agree together touching something we shall ask in his name," in well-founded confidence that God will " fulfil our desires and petitions, so far as may be most expedient for us ;" since we have our Lord's own assurance, that " if two or three of us shall agree on earth touching something that we shall ask, it shall be given us by our Father who is in heaven."

Unite, therefore, I beseech you, your prayers with mine, that it may please Him to sustain and to prosper this Association, founded and carried on for the sole purpose of promoting his glory, and the eternal welfare of his people: pray that He may invigorate the exertions, and, by wisdom from above, direct the counsels, of us, the governors, and other members of it; and that He may crown our efforts with success in diffusing the knowledge and love of Him among the people of this Country; that thus we may be among the means of causing the "name of our Father, who is in heaven, to be hallowed, and his kingdom to be extended, and his will to be done in earth as in heaven," and the bread of eternal life,—the spiritual sustenance of the soul —to be more and more widely distributed: and pray that our endeavours may not be defeated for want of the timely assistance of our fellow-Christians, but that it will please God to grant a spirit of Christian benevolence to those many congregations whose contributions to the good work are this day solicited; that they may have grace thus to convert their perishable earthly goods into everlasting treasure in heaven.

But after we have thus agreed in offering up these, our common supplications, on this occasion, do not then, I entreat you, as soon as you have laid down your own contribution, go home and dismiss the whole subject thenceforward from your thoughts; but retain in your memory this occasion, and the Society in whose behalf you shall have now offered up your silent prayers. Remember us often in your solitary meditations; in your conversation with your friends,—in your private addresses to the throne of grace. We ask that place in your hearts,—that share in your secret devotions,—which we assign to you in ours; and we ask your aid in cherishing a feeling of Christian brotherhood between yourselves and us, and those our fellow-Christians, who are the objects of our cares. And when He, "the Chief Shepherd, shall appear," may we all be associated together in his presence; may He "make us to be numbered with his saints in glory everlasting!"

Now to Him that is able to do exceeding abundantly, above all that we ask or think, the only-wise God, be glory in the Church, by Christ Jesus, throughout all ages. Amen.

THE EVIDENCE

AS TAKEN BEFORE THE

SELECT COMMITTEE OF THE HOUSE OF LORDS,

APPOINTED TO INQUIRE INTO THE COLLECTION AND PAYMENT OF

TITHES IN IRELAND,

AND THE STATE OF THE LAWS RELATING THERETO,

IN THE YEAR 1832.

Καὶ γὰρ ἐκείνων ὁ πληγεὶς ἀεὶ τῆς πληγῆς ἔχεται· κἂν ἑτέρωσε πατάξῃ τις, ἐκεῖσε εἰσιν αἱ χεῖρες· προβάλλεσθαι δὲ, ἢ βλέπειν ἐναντίον, οὔτ' οἶδεν, οὔτ' ἐθέλει. Demost. Phil. i.

PREFATORY NOTICE.

I HAVE appended to the "Lectures on Political-Economy" extracts of such portions of this Evidence as were the most closely connected with the subject there treated of. But it appeared advisable in this place to reprint it entire; trusting to the reader to excuse the insertion of some matters of little moment,—repetitions and interruptions, necessarily resulting from the mode in which an examination before a Committee is conducted.

The opinions expressed remain, except where I may have specified the contrary, substantially unchanged; though, of course, proposals which may have been at that time reasonable, may have since become impracticable. It will be seen, I think, that subsequent experience has fully established the correctness of some of the views taken at that time, though I had not then been three months in Ireland; and the others, who had spent their lives here, had then arrived at different conclusions, partly perhaps from having been accustomed to view all objects through the discoloured medium of party-feeling.

I have only to add, in this place, that I have no intention of imputing to any individual, or body of men, any censure of the course pursued by them, or even any disapprobation on their part, of every suggestion which they did not adopt; since I am well aware that a minister may sometimes find it unadvisable even to propose some measure which he may consider as in itself the best, from a conviction of the impossibility of carrying it.

MINUTES OF EVIDENCE,

&c. &c.

Die Lunæ, 30° *Januarii*, 1832.

HAS your Grace had an opportunity, during the time that you have been resident in Ireland, of acquainting yourself with the nature of the resistance which has been opposed to the payment of Tithe, and the causes which have occasioned it?

I have taken great pains,—more especially within the last six weeks, when I apprehended it likely that I should be called before this Committee,—to ascertain from various quarters all I could learn upon the subject; and I have seen letters from a great number of the Clergy, not only in my own diocese and province, but in various other parts: and I am inclined to think that I have ascertained the state of things in many parts of Ireland, both with respect to the actual resistance that has been offered, and the circumstances that have contributed to it.

Will your Grace be so good as to state, as nearly as you can, those circumstances, both as they have occurred in your own diocese, and as they have been represented to you from sufficient authority, as occurring in other parts of Ireland?

I have endeavoured, among other things, to ascertain particularly whether the resistance is of a different character in those parishes that have been compounded, or whether they are comparatively exempt; and the result of all my inquiries has been, that it must arise from some causes that do not apply exclusively to those where the Tithe has not been compounded. I have here a letter from a Clergyman in Maryborough, to whom I proposed, as I did to several others, that question; and he states, as many others have done, (I have not received one testimony to the contrary,) that the object is the utter abolition of the whole system, without taking into account the interests that will be affected at the expiration of the existing leases, and without making any distinction as to composition or non-composition. I have a letter from the county of Tipperary, stating, as all the rest have done, "In this neighbourhood composition is resisted as much as Tithe;" and the opinion

of the writer (Mr. Woodward *) is, that the lay impropriators are fully as much resisted as the clerical incumbents. He states his belief that some Clergymen have received little or nothing for the three last years. I should add, however, that the state of things in that respect is very different: some have not received for two or even three years; some have only a year or a year and a half of arrears; and, in a great many instances, no appearance of opposition has been known till within these two months.

I have received information, from sources which I cannot consistently with the personal safety of the parties divulge, which leads me to feel certain, in some instances, and very strongly to suspect in many others, that the resistance to tithe payment, in numerous parishes, may be traced to the reading of Dr. Doyle's well-known Letter, from the chapel altar, by the priest, accompanied with such comments and exhortations as have encouraged some, and intimidated others, of the parishioners, into a resistance to which, but a very few days before, they had

* A pamphlet, subsequently published by this gentleman, is well worthy of perusal.

shewn no disposition. It appears that, in some instances, this has been done by the *parish* priest; in others (where the regular priest was of a peaceable character, and unwilling to act such a part), by a stranger-priest, who has always been ascertained or believed to have come from Dr. Doyle's diocese. And the result has been, that in parishes where one week there had appeared every disposition to peaceable and ready payment, the next week there has arisen a sudden and most violent resistance: all composition has been refused; the labourers of the incumbent have been intimidated from collecting the Tithes in kind; every species of fraud and violence, and every possible legal evasion have been resorted to, to prevent the incumbent from obtaining his due. A parish purse has been raised to meet law expenses for this purpose; and the result has been, that in most instances nothing whatever, in others only a very small proportion of the arrears, has been recovered.

All this has taken place in some parishes on which the incumbent has resided a great number of years, and has always, till now, been on friendly terms with his parishioners. I know

that in one parish some extensive farmers had reduced into writing a formal proposal for a composition, and that the proposal was signed by the parishioners at a fair in the neighbourhood. The fair was held on Saturday; and in consequence, as is supposed, of Dr. Doyle's Letter having been read and commented on on the Sunday, on the following day, instead of his receiving the proposal for composition, notices were served on the Clergyman by those very persons to take the Tithe in kind. He was forced to procure labourers to the amount of sixty or thereabouts, from distant counties, and at high wages, who yet were incapable of obtaining more than a small portion of Tithes, being assailed and interrupted by a rabble, chiefly women, though men were lurking in the background to support them. He instituted a tithe suit, which was decided in his favour; but instead of receiving the amount, he was met by an appeal to the High Court of Delegates, and is informed that a continued resistance to the utmost extremity of the law is to be supported by a parish purse. I should add, that he has been above twenty years,—I think twenty-three

or twenty-four,—the incumbent of that parish, and has never met with any opposition, or had any disagreement with his parishioners till now; and the change he describes took place between Saturday and Monday.

To what causes do you attribute the origin of this resistance?

I attribute it to a concurrence of various causes operating on different classes of men. All farmers, whether Protestant or Roman Catholic, are liable to the fallacy of supposing that they really pay the Tithes, though they are virtually so much deducted from the rent; and, in truth, any portion of Tithe which a farmer can succeed in withholding during the current lease is so much clear gain to him. Then, in the next place, the Roman Catholic is accustomed to consider this payment to a Protestant Clergyman as so much withdrawn from those whom his Catechism teaches him to regard, as by Divine Law, the rightful owners. [I do not know whether that allusion is sufficiently understood. I have a Roman Catholic Catechism in my hand, which will explain it. This is a

Catechism used in Roman Catholic schools, I do not know how extensively, but certainly in the neighbourhood of Dublin, in which, after the Commandments of the Bible, are put eight Commandments of the Church; the last of these is, "And to his Church" (that is, the Church of God) "neglect not Tithes to pay." The commandments are put in rhyme, and learnt by heart. To each there is a comment: "What is ordained by the eighth commandment?—To pay Tithes to the lawful pastors of the Church." I suppose the word Church requires no explanation; it is well known that the Roman Catholics never allow the title of a Church to any but their own.

Is that a Catechism understood to be of authority?

It is a Catechism which I understand to be from authority, and which I know to be used in Roman Catholic schools in the neighbourhood of Dublin. It was printed in 1831.] Then, again, all who, either from motives of personal ambition or from religious or national animosity, wish for the overthrow of the Established Church, are naturally led to look to the destruction of

the endowments as a ready means of accomplishing their object.

Have not those misconceptions and misrepresentations always existed upon the subject of Tithes?

I have not the least doubt that they always have. But an organization has taken place of late, by a secret combination of persons, aiming perhaps at ultimate ends that are different, but uniting in one common object as an immediate end. Advantage has been taken, by skilful and determined agitators, of a favourable conjuncture for calling forth the smothered discontent relative to the tithe system, which had arisen from causes long before existing.

What do you conceive to be the cause of this opposition at the present moment?

I can hardly presume to give a decisive answer. But I will observe, that there appears to be in Ireland a tendency to consider measures as measures of *favour* and disfavour rather than of right or *justice;* and if a notion is maintained that such and such things are done for the relief of either class, Protestants or Roman Catholics,

they are apt to interpret it as a measure of favour;—as so much done for one *party*, not for justice, and they endeavour to presume a little further. There is a very lax kind of morality which I have often found prevailing, that if a person has claimed something which has been considered his due, and which has been granted him for that reason, he will be by this encouraged to encroach upon something that is *not* his due; not considering it as a grant of a right that he has obtained, but as a matter of favour, or something yielded to intimidation. Now, I suppose it can scarcely be denied that the concession of the Catholic claims was considered (by a great many at least) as granted to intimidation; and any thing that appears to be conceded in that manner, however just and reasonable, has the effect immediately of exciting cupidity and ambition, and of directing men's attention to something beyond: their having a fair right to such further concession, or not, seems hardly to enter into their consideration. I have no doubt therefore, myself, that the concession of the Catholic claims, from the *manner* in which it was understood to be

conceded, as something that *could* not be withheld, has contributed to embolden the Roman Catholics in many instances to organize a plan for obtaining something more.

You conceive then it is the concession of the Roman Catholic claims which has led to these further demands?

I should say that, with this qualification, that it is the *mode* in which it was conceived to have been conceded; its being conceded (I may almost say, I believe, *avowedly*) as a thing which could not be withheld. That at least is undoubtedly the general impression, as far as I can collect, of the Roman Catholics themselves. I should not say the concession itself, but the mode in which they apprehend it to have been conceded. I would not say that if it had been granted twenty or thirty years ago, when there was no violent clamour and outcry, no spirit of opposition to the Government, that then the same effect, at least to the same extent, would have been produced.

Do you suppose that if it had not been granted when it was, but had still been withheld, that this resistance to Tithes would not have taken place?

I am very much disposed to agree with those who think that not only resistance to Tithes and to Government generally, but absolute civil war, would have been the result.

Do you attribute the increased extension of this resistance to any other causes than you do its origin?

I consider that there is an organized and a secret combination of persons, looking to a common immediate object, the leaders of which are enabled to afford encouragement to some whose views coincide with their own, and to intimidate others, both by the desperate measures they adopt towards all who oppose them, and by the dread inspired by the obscurity in which all their movements are enveloped, which leads to perhaps exaggerated ideas of their actual force. Instances have come to my knowledge, of parishioners, both Protestant and Roman Catholic, professing privately (whether sincerely or not) their willingness to pay, but that they could not with safety to their lives. I have even ascertained that Roman Catholics, as well as Protestants, last year requested the incumbent to accept two years' payment, from

an expectation that combined resistance this year would render it unsafe for them to pay at all. The clearest and most concise expression of the view I have endeavoured to convey, would be in the words of the Roman historian: "Is habitus animorum fuit, ut pessimum facinus auderent pauci, plures vellent, omnes paterentur."

Do you feel any expectation that there will be any cessation or relaxation of this resistance?

I cannot say that I do; but I must add, that on that point different persons have given me different accounts. Some of my Clergy have held out hopes that all will come right; that the resistance is not greater than it has often been before; and that, in some way, which they have not satisfactorily explained to me, matters will come round again, if vigorous measures are adopted, if proper steps are taken, without specifying precisely how those effects are to be brought about. But I must say, that the greater part of those whose views seem to be more accurately and carefully considered, have held out no hope of the opposition going off, and

relaxing of itself. The circumstances which have led them to that conclusion are, the many variations from the former state of things, when resistance to Tithes, and other lawless acts, were going on; particularly the agitation existing in England; the incendiarism and riot that has taken place here; and the generally disturbed state of the Continent; which undoubtedly affords, as they all seem to be sensible, a very great degree of encouragement to the agitators in Ireland. They feel themselves favoured by that example, and likely to be supported (through the diversion thus created) by the general disturbances throughout Europe.

Do you suppose that if the resistance to Tithes should be successful it would stop there?

I am fully convinced, as far as my own observations and conjectures can go, that it would not. If, by a measure of Government, indeed, Tithes were to be abolished, if the whole of the church property were to be confiscated by law, the evil might stop there; but I am fully convinced that (in Ireland especially) when men found that they could withhold payment of

lawful debts, and could encroach upon their neighbours' property by the strong hand, they would immediately proceed from one thing to another. And I have ascertained as a fact, in some instances, that there are tenants who pay scarcely any rent at all, but whose landlords dare not turn them out, and are forced to accept any thing they offer, or nothing, from knowing that probably their lives, and certainly their property, would not otherwise be safe. If therefore the resistance to Tithes is to go on unrestrained, and an unlimited concession made to the resistance, I have no doubt that rent, in a great many instances, if not in all, will follow.

Is not resistance made now to the payment of rent in many parts of Ireland?

In some instances landlords do not obtain any thing from tenants; but in many instances where they do, they acknowledge that they are forced to content themselves with just whatever payment the tenant chooses to make, since they dare not displace him, whether he is a bad payer or refuses to pay at all; knowing that the mass of the people in the neighbourhood would

immediately revenge themselves for his expulsion, at least upon any one who should succeed him. In some instances, I have heard of farms remaining unoccupied, from nobody's being found to dare to take possession of them.

To what parts of the country do those observations apply?

I have heard most frequent instances of them, owing, perhaps, not to the fact being different in many other places, but to the persons with whom I have happened to have communication, from Tipperary and Clare; but I am far from saying it exists to a greater degree there than in some other parts with which I am not so much acquainted.

You have stated that many of the Clergy with whom you have conversed are of opinion that strong measures would put an end to the evil: are you of opinion that by strong measures the collection of Tithes could be enforced, under the present system?

I think that the arrears might be obtained by vigorous measures, accompanied with a promise of relief in future; at least I am inclined to hope that: and it seems to be the only thing that is to

be hoped. But as for the continuance of the Tithe system, it seems to me that it must be at the point of the bayonet; that it must be through a sort of chronic civil war. The ill feelings that have so long existed against it have been embodied in so organized a combination, that I conceive there would be continually breakings-out of resistance, which must be kept down by a continuance of very severe measures, such as the Government might indeed resolve to have recourse to for once, if necessary, but would be very unwilling to resort to habitually, so as to keep the country under military government. And the most intelligent persons, and the most experienced I have conversed with, seem to think that nothing else will permanently secure the payment of Tithes under the present system.

Did those persons who wished for rigorous measures suggest what the character of them should be?

The greater part merely said they wished for the strong interference of Government; but there are some that have suggested the character of the measures. A Clergyman writes to me a letter, in which, after stating the resistance he

has met with, he says, " We are decidedly of opinion, from our knowledge of what has been and is still going on in this place, that any attempt of the tithe owners to recover their just rights, as determined either by final decrees in our favour, or returns of tithe composition, would end either in a violation of the public peace or a fradulent evasion. We deem it best to submit quietly to the existing system of spoliation, until either a counter system is brought into operation, whereby the adverse combination can be effectually defeated, or until the Legislature shall in its wisdom provide an adequate remedy. In the hope of being enabled to procure means of subsistence for the families of ourselves and our curates, in paying a high rent of residency where there are no glebe houses, as in my own case, we have come to a resolution of giving effect without loss of time to a system of the above nature (that is, what he calls the counter system), by transferring all our legal power into the hands of an individual of decided respectability, a layman, and who will undertake, upon a liberal plan, the collection of what is due to us. As it would not be in our

power, in the present state of our means, exhausted as they are by fruitless law expenses, as well as reduced by the absence of professional resources, to meet every charge consequent on a vigorous assertion of our rights, a circular is about to be addressed to those friends of the common cause who have not as yet endured our privations, calling on them to contribute to a fund that would prove adequate to meet the numerous expenses in obtaining an effectual recovery of our rights, and virtually of those of the Established Clergy at large."

What is the date of that communication?

It is dated the 16th of December.

Has your Grace had any means of ascertaining since what was the result of the measures so described to have been taken?

The measures have not yet been actually taken, but the circular alluded to has been sent, and contributions have been collected. I have already mentioned that one of my Clergy was obliged to employ not less than sixty labourers to collect his Tithes; I say not less than sixty,

because it was unsafe to employ a smaller number, on account of the forcible opposition they expected: and now, if twenty or thirty Clergymen, or more, had combined, it is probable that there would have been a counter combination, which would have rendered it necessary for the tithe collectors to employ each about the same proportion as the one individual just mentioned. I cannot conceive that any thing short of an absolute battle could have been the result, unless a much greater military force than I suppose could be sent in detachments to various parts in the country could be stationed ready to prevent it. One gentleman, whom I have generally found to be a very moderate-spoken person, estimated an assemblage in the neighbourhood of his house, in the county of Wicklow, meeting to declaim against Tithes, and to threaten all that should pay them, at 30,000. He is probably not well versed in the computation of numbers; but that was his conjecture, from the immense space of ground that was covered with them. I mention this only to point out the great numbers who muster.

There are two questions to be considered: one the immediate evil of the great amount of the Tithe in arrear, and the consequently distressed state of the Clergy; and the other, the permanent system that should be adopted to make provision for the Clergy. What remedy would you propose for the present evil?

It seems to me that the remedy for the *immediate* evil is in a great degree connected with the *permanent* settlement of the church property: for not only the present distress is great under which the Clergy now lie, but, in relation to a future arrangement, every thing almost must depend upon the feeling of the two parties concerned, the tithe payers and the tithe owners; and this again must greatly depend on the attitude assumed by Government.

Many of the resisters to Tithe entertain, or endeavour to spread, the notion that they are favoured by Government. In the papers which advocate those opinions of hostility to Tithe, I have seen sentiments of that kind frequently put forth. One instance I recollect of their mentioning, that the soldiers at such a place had purchased some of the cattle distrained for Tithe; and after commenting in the most violent

terms upon the enormity of this, they expressed a hope that the commander-in-chief would take proper notice of such abominable conduct of the soldiers as purchasing the tithe cattle. These persons, of course, if such a notion be not contradicted by strong measures, would be probably unwilling to accede to any fair plan of commutation; some from hatred to the Establishment, and a strong hope in their own minds of overthrowing it, and some from feeling or thinking that they need not purchase an exemption which they have already obtained by a strong hand.

Many, again, of the tithe owners and their friends, and the friends generally of the Protestant Establishment, very strongly entertain and encourage a similar suspicion: an idea is impressed on their minds of their being abandoned, or likely to be abandoned by Government; and they expect that commutation would lead to virtual confiscation.

In order, therefore, as it seems to me, to obtain the consent of either party to any arrangement of any sort that should be fair for both parties, the firm determination must be evinced, to afford

indeed relief in future from grievances and inconveniences, but in the meantime to protect property, and to enforce the payment of that which is actually due. Much will depend therefore upon the steps taken relative to those arrears which cannot be recovered by legal means. No plan of commutation could be adopted which should throw in these arrears. A person absolutely entitled to mortgage-money, for instance, may without loss let arrears of interest be added to the principal; but if a tenant for life does so, he gives up part of his own income to benefit his successors. But besides the present sufferings of the Clergy, which are very severe, it is important, with a view to any commutation or arrangement, that these should be assured that their rights will be protected, and that their opponents should be assured that lawless resistance will be effectually put down.*

* The object aimed at by this proposal was not solely to relieve the distress of the Clergy, but, still more, to remove at once the existing subject of *contest*, preparatory to the immediate adoption of such measures as might prevent its renewal;—to clear the ship of water (if I may use a homely but appropriate metaphor) preparatory to the stopping of the leak. The measure, therefore, actually adopted, of advancing a *portion* of

It has been suggested accordingly, by some friends of mine, in a consultation with me, that some such plan as this should be resorted to: that Government should offer security for the payment of the unpaid Tithes of the last year, or of the last two years, throughout Ireland: that government-bonds to that effect (a paper somewhat in the nature of exchequer bills) should be issued in each case to the full amount of the Tithes (estimated according to what might have been expected to be received by the Clergymen had the opposition not taken place), and be made payable within some specified period of three or four or five years, as may seem most expedient—these bonds in the meantime carrying a low interest, perhaps about two per cent.; and they should be granted to any applicant on these conditions, that he shall produce evidence of his having used all lawful and prudent means for obtaining his Tithe himself [I suppose it will

the arrears, did not go one step towards effecting *that* object; since it left the *dispute* just where it was. A more complete measure accordingly was resorted to at a later period, when the circumstances that had occurred in the interval had made it more troublesome, more costly, and far less effectual.

be understood what is meant by *prudent* means; for there are many lawful means that might cost a man's life]; and, secondly, that he is ready to comply with a certain proposed plan (of which an outline may be submitted to him) for altering the tithe system in future, and placing church property on a better footing. On those government-bonds, the Clergy, who need it, may easily raise ready money; and although the money so raised must fall short of the amount of their Tithes, if paid, this very circumstance would have the advantage of stimulating the Clergy still to use their best endeavours to get the tithe payment for themselves; they ought not to be so assisted as to make it a matter of indifference whether they exert themselves or not. I should anticipate, as the result of this measure, that a great portion of the refractory parishes will come to terms with their Clergy, when they find that the Government has decidedly taken their part, and has given security for their Tithes, and when they feel that the security can only be redeemed by a rate laid upon them. This appears to me the more likely, because the measure would be accompanied with an avowal

of the design of altering the tithe system for the future.

In those cases, however, where the result of the scheme shall not be the payment of Tithes, how is Government to redeem its pledges? It will be necessary, I conceive, that Government should disavow, in the outset, all intention of raising the money for this purpose out of the general taxation of the United Kingdom; it would be necessary, also, to disavow the intention of paying for the recusant parishes out of taxes laid equally on all parishes in Ireland. The tax should, perhaps, be a general rate on all the tithe payers in Ireland, or on all the refractory parishes, admitting as a plea of exemption, a receipt shewing that no arrears of Tithe are due.

This plan has not been suggested as being without difficulties, or unquestionable as to its results; but it should be borne in mind, that the difficulties are those which *must* be encountered, whether the measure be resorted to or not, for getting through the present emergency. The question of tithe payment is a question of debt, according to the existing laws; and whatever

change be made in the law for the future, a settlement of existing claims must enter into the deliberations of the Legislature, and must involve the main difficulties attached to the scheme. Supposing a plan of commutation adopted, which should satisfy all parties for the future, how are numbers of the Irish parochial Clergy to find subsistence in the mean time? and supposing them to obtain support by loan, or otherwise, during the interval, (by loan is meant voluntarily contributed by friends,) still their demand for arrears legally due to them is one that will be pressed on Government, and one that cannot be rejected without shaking the security of all property, though more especially property held by public Bodies. The question is not merely whether the Clergy shall have their dues awarded to them at present or not, but one the issue of which will decide the power of Government to protect any kind of property; at least any which may be so far similarly circumstanced, as to become obnoxious to popular envy; whether from lying in prominent masses, and so being exposed to public remark, or from its being of a description that interferes with

popular prejudices, or simply from its suggesting a ready means of national relief in any season of distress and discontent.

I allude to (what has been thrown out in various shapes) the suggestion of applying Tithes to the purpose of establishing a fund for the relief of the poor, similar to the endowments of parishes of England; something that shall do all the good of the poor laws, and at the same time not to be a burden to the parishioners. This would certainly be (as far as I have been able to ascertain from the greater part of my Clergy) a popular measure even with Protestants.

Do you intend that government-bonds should be issued upon the security of the Tithe, or that Government should collect the arrears of Tithe for the discharge of its own paper?

That the Clergy should sell their arrears to Government for exchequer bills or other such paper money.

Upon what security do you mean that this paper should be issued?

The Government should levy a rate upon either all the parishes in Ireland, or all the refractory parishes; from which rate an exemption might be claimed on producing a receipt shewing no tithes to be due. But I have purposely abstained from entering into the details.

You mean a government security, subject to the Government remunerating itself by the means you have described?

Yes; but I considered it rather out of my province to enter at large into the precise mode in which Government were to provide for levying a compensation to themselves. Indeed I should add, that this was a suggestion which I did not think worth entering fully into, till I could sound people's minds as to the degree of satisfaction that any measure of the kind would be likely to give. The proposal has been laid before a good many of the Clergy, and a great part of them have answered, not only that they would gladly accept of it, but that they believe, in most instances, the mere offer, in those counties which are not in the most disturbed

state, would do away with the incipient opposition to Tithe, and that there would not be occasion for the Clergy actually to avail themselves of such aid, but that they would be secured by the offer of it: and many of them have added, that they are convinced the confidence of the Clergy and other friends of the Establishment in Government, and their willingness to accede to a reasonable plan of commutation, would be greatly affected by such an offer of relief, and would, in fact, almost depend upon it, as it would convince them that there was no intention of sacrificing their rights. It would not only give them a most welcome relief, but it would evince the determination of Government to protect them.

I am very much inclined to think that the proposed interference of Government in behalf of the Clergy would not increase, but rather allay, the irritation, or at least the confident anticipation of success, among the resisters to Tithe, from the circumstance that many of them are encouraged by the idea that Government either is on their side, or is afraid to oppose them: and, in propagating this notion, they

are very much aided by many friends of the Establishment, who hold similar language. And the opposers of Tithe endeavour to avail themselves of the supposed advantages of their situation, without the smallest degree of gratitude to Government, or reverence for it.

What is your opinion of the permanent system upon which the provision for the Church should be placed in Ireland?

I should premise that I think it would be a very dangerous thing to legislate in a way that should carry on the face of it the appearance of relief for Ireland, without holding out a prospect, at least, of some, if not the same, system of relief in England; because if it were understood that relief from what has been lately and is still, in many instances, complained of as a grievance in England, was given in Ireland, in consequence of violent and turbulent measures, it seems to me that that would be a bonus on insurrection in England, and I have no doubt the most fearful results would follow.

Does not the Tithe in England stand upon a very different footing from that in Ireland?

It does; but though *all* the causes which occasion it to be unpopular in Ireland do not exist in England, yet I think that many of them do; and the fact is, that it *has* been complained of as a grievance in many instances in England; partly on just grounds, and partly on others which are imaginary; but still it is felt as a grievance. There is, I am convinced, so much disposition to oppose Tithe, dormant, as it were, in England, that if, in Ireland, resistance were *rewarded* by concession, many persons in England would immediately try the experiment whether Tithes could not be diverted to the purpose of providing a substitute for the poor-rates. One of the topics which has been the most strenuously resorted to by many of the leaders of the opposition to Tithe, is, that a fund by that means would be provided for the relief of the poor. Now, in England, perhaps, that might be urged with quite as great force; for many are ignorant enough to believe that the sacrifice of the Tithes for the maintenance of paupers would not only prevent all distress in the Country, but remove entirely the burden of poor-rates. I have no doubt, therefore, that

resistance would be generated by a relief held out to Ireland, accompanied by no prospect or promise of any thing being done with respect to the mode of collecting church revenue in England.

Without reference to that consideration, what would you propose in Ireland?

I had contemplated a plan of commutation for England long before I had any thoughts of being settled in Ireland; and I have not found the circumstances of that country sufficiently different from those of England to make it less desirable in Ireland, but rather even more so; though perhaps some greater difficulties may be incurred in the details. I will shortly state the outline of that plan, after a few prefatory remarks.

1st, The measure which in any case may be the first in point of *importance* may not always be the first to be considered in point of *time*. Those whose main object is to commute Tithes, may perhaps find that that object will be the most easily accomplished through some preliminary arrangements which may be thought in

themselves insignificant. 2dly, With respect to the desirableness of such an arrangement, I would premise another remark, that an apparent advantage or disadvantage may be in effect a real one in proportion as it is *believed* to be such. If a sick man's mind is soothed or is irritated by some application which is in itself inert, that soothing or that irritation may produce a real effect upon the disorder; a grievance may be imaginary, and yet the complaint founded upon it may lead to consequences by no means imaginary.

There are many reasons (with which I will not trouble your Lordships at present) which induce me to think that Tithes are a disadvantageous kind of church property, generally; and I would propose, as a preliminary step to commutation, (preliminary I mean in order, not necessarily in time; because both may be simultaneously introduced,) that the whole of the church property, in each diocese, or archdeaconry, or district, that may be selected, should be thrown into a common stock, in the hands of a dean and chapter, or a board, or college, or whatever else it might be called, which should

be constituted a corporation, and should distribute, according to a valuation, the share due to each incumbent, in proportion to the value of the Tithes of his benefice; exactly in the same manner as each college at Oxford or Cambridge manages, through its bursars, the joint property, and allots to each fellow, scholar, exhibitioner, &c. his proper share out of the common fund.* A very small per-centage, compared with what is paid by many incumbents to their agents, would afford sufficient remuneration to the commissioner, since it would be far less trouble in proportion to collect the revenues of fifty parishes than of one. There would then, even if no commutation at all took place, be a removal or alleviation of almost all the evils which are complained of. There would be an end of the frauds which take place in the collection of Tithes and other church dues; of the bickerings about Tithes; of refusing to go to church on account of personal enmity with the Clergyman, and the like; and leases of the church property might be granted without any

* See Note A. at the end of the Evidence.

more difficulty than now occurs in respect of the property of colleges and chapters.

But no other plan would so much facilitate commutation. One of the commonest objections to a commutation for land is, "Where, in some parishes, can you find land to serve the purpose?" and "You will have to build farmhouses and barns, &c. and to keep them in repair; and if a good tenant could not be found, the parson must become a farmer," &c. Now, on the proposed plan, Tithes might be commuted by the corporation, for land, wherever land could be most easily found. It might be done, if precipitate changes were thought inexpedient, as gradually as could be wished, by private arrangement in each particular instance; that is, by allowing the Tithes to be redeemed, if not for land, for money, to be laid out in the purchase of land; and if any disputes arose, the pastor might remain perfectly at peace with his people, quite unconnected with the business, as much as a fellow of any college residing in a parish where his college holds property of any kind. If any farmer should come to complain to a fellow of a college, under those circumstances,

about rents or tithes, he would at once explain to him that he must apply to the bursar of the college.

I have long satisfied myself of the inexpediency of Tithes as an endowment, and of the unsoundness of some of the objections which have been brought against land as a substitute; and in confirmation of my views I will now read a passage from a letter from a Clergyman of the name of Hardy, resident at Kilcullen:—" I have always considered the present system of collecting church income prejudicial to the successful discharge of our duty. The common and necessary consequences of money transactions between man and man are calculated to generate prejudice against the message we are sent to deliver in the minds of worldly men. If this be the case with our own flock, what must be the effect on men who are taught to consider our faith heretical? The bad consequences of this I have seen throughout my ministry, whether I was an assistant curate, not receiving Tithes, or a beneficed Clergyman; though since I became a receiver of Tithes I have done all in my power to lessen the evil, and never suffered

a parishioner to be driven for Tithe due to me. I therefore consider it would be of the first importance to the cause of religion, and the promotion of peace in our too-much-distracted country, were this question settled, first, as of necessity, by a general composition, and finally by commutation. The first, to attain the object sought, should be so altered from its present mode as to make the landlords (in Ireland chiefly Protestant) pay the amount, instead of their (usually) Roman Catholic tenantry. I could shew that this would be no real grievance to the landlord, but the reverse, inasmuch as the value of his estate would be augmented by the peace ensuing from the settlement of a most fertile source of agitation, and where the interests of the Clergy would be considered. I speak from experience. I should prefer 80*l.* a year, paid half-yearly by one person, to 100*l.* irregularly, by perhaps as many discontented parishioners. Were the composition so settled, I apprehend commutation would not be difficult as a subsequent measure. When the landlord was a man of money, he would willingly clear off such an incumbrance, and the money so

obtained could be invested, first in the public funds under trustees, and after, as opportunity might serve, in any part of the country, to lay it out in the purchase of land." I have read this letter because it was written without any previous communication from me. This gentleman has been represented to me as a man of the highest character, respectability, and good sense, and of great experience. He mentions another subject also, which, though it is not exactly part of the present, is connected with it, that of church cess.

Will you state what occurs to you on the subject of the church cess, as far as you consider it to be connected with the question of Tithe?

It is so far connected with it, that I have no doubt it has led to and fostered a great part of the hostile feeling that has existed amongst the Roman Catholics, not so much on account of the heavy amount, for I am not aware of any cases in which it has been a very heavy burthen, but on account of its uncertainty;—of its being uncertain in the amount levied, and in the times at which it is called for; and also from its being

felt more distinctly a *payment* than Tithes, because its uncertainty prevents it from being regularly allowed for as so much discount. It goes also immediately to purposes which are abhorrent to the feelings of the Roman Catholics. A payment, which you may easily conceive is extremely minute in a whole parish, for the bread and wine to the communion service, is horrifying to the feelings of many of them, and is as galling as if we were called upon to pay a few pence towards the decoration of an idol temple. I am acquainted with a very worthy and sensible Clergyman, an Irishman of great experience, who makes a point of always purchasing the communion bread and wine out of his own purse, and has been censured for so doing, as having given up some of the rights of the Church: but he has declared to me that he could not bring himself to do otherwise, after he had found what feelings the payment excited. There is also a very strong suspicion, almost perhaps a belief, among the Roman Catholics in many parishes, that there are jobs contrived for the sake of bringing profit to Protestant workmen. I cannot state any cases in which that

has actually taken place, but I know the feeling exists in their minds. This gentleman observes, the " Church cess is an irregular tax; the farmer cannot calculate its probable amount in the way he can Tithe; it more properly therefore comes under the denomination of a tax. If Tithes were abolished, he would pay the amount to his landlord; not so as to church cess, which, not being so well defined, cannot be put into calculation. Thus he more seriously considers it as a tax to be got rid of if possible. With a rational man, the same argument does not apply to Tithe. And by abolishing church cess, we should disarm our enemies of one very efficient weapon, which is constantly used against us. I am informed it is the determination of the Roman Catholics to resist the payment of church cess in this parish this next year, as they are resisting Tithe now." I have now in my hand a letter, not of a confidential nature, from Doctor Bernard, Dean of Leighlin, which was sent in answer to some general inquiries, giving a statement of what occurred in his neighbourhood, and the suggestions that he proposes, and which have been proposed by others.

[The Letter is delivered in and read, and is as follows:]

My Lord, 16*th Jan.* 1832.

Having been requested to convey to your Grace such information respecting the combination against Tithes, which exists in the diocese of Leighlin and its vicinity, I do not delay in addressing you on the subject, which may be considered as of the utmost importance, whether as respecting the rights and subsistence of the Clergy, or the peace and tranquillity of the country. From the circumstance of my holding two adjoining benefices, one of which has been compounded for, under the provisions of the Tithe Composition Act, whilst in the other that Act has not been carried into effect, I am enabled to state, that there does not exist *a much greater facility* of collecting the Clergyman's income in the former than in the latter parish. The objection now raised in Ireland against Tithes is not so much directed to remove any *excess of charge* which has been made, as against the payment of *any income whatever to the Clergyman.* This my own case clearly proves; for having, about two years since, been requested by the parishioners of Wells to make an abatement on the sum which the parish had been compounded for in 1823, and which they alleged was disproportioned to the then state of prices, I immediately acceded to their request, and for that year reduced my income nearly one-third, from 392*l.* to 276*l.*, agreeing to a subsequent and permanent reduction of about one-fifth, or 315*l.* for 392*l.*, (the sum certified

and compounded for;) yet notwithstanding I received public thanks at the time for what I had done, I am not now in any respect differently circumstanced from my neighbours who would not make any reduction, and whose incomes are withholden. Even those who benefited most largely by the above reduction, and who were most thankful at the moment, now say (although they have no fault to find) they are forbidden from making me any payment on account of Tithes, and they dread the consequences; and one person, who took his land subsequently to the composition being established, now pays his landlord in full, rather than (as he ought) hand him my receipt for the composition money, which would be as cash in the settlement of his rent. Capiases have been served on some of the chief defaulters in that parish, but as yet nothing effectual has resulted from the steps taken. In my adjoining parish of Shankill, no valuation was last harvest permitted to be made; and from the affidavit of the two men whom I employed in the business, it appears that they were forcibly driven from the parish by a number of persons, who severely beat them, destroyed their books, and desired them never to attempt such a proceeding for the future, as it was contrary to the orders of the priest. In this instance, my only decisive remedy is by a bill in Chancery, which I have directed to be proceeded with, but hitherto nothing has been effected by it, from the difficulty of serving processes. Rendering the Tithe Composition Act compulsory would be chiefly beneficial, in order exactly to ascertain the value of every parish; but in point of fact I do not find that payments have been

more regularly made where it prevails than where it does not; and I consider it chiefly valuable as rendering the charge more equitable amongst the parishioners, by including agistment lands, and by avoiding the trouble and expense of an annual valuation and settlement. After the best consideration I can give the subject, it appears to me that nothing short of a decided commutation of Tithe can ever produce a satisfactory result; and it surely is both the duty and the policy of Government to effect such an arrangement, so that no just cause of complaint can be made, either by the Clergy, that they are defrauded of their incomes without a fair equivalent, or by the landed proprietors, that their estates are overcharged. I conceive it to be alike the interest of the Clergy and the laity that an effectual settlement of this question should take place. The former, aware of the difficulty of collecting tithe rent or composition, will naturally be disposed to take a lesser income, if more regularly paid; and the latter, having authority, and a power of ejectment, which the Clergyman has not, can more easily recover from the tenant, and will no doubt feel, that by having full dominion over their estates, by commuting the Tithes for an acreable land tax, (redeemable, and apportioned fairly amongst all persons having interests in the land,) they would benefit materially; for, as things have gone on of late, their tenants, by suffering their property to be sold for next to nothing under a distress by the Clergy, are evidently less able to pay the landlord's rent, and are less solvent tenants. Again, were Tithe totally done away, the landlord alone would benefit; but he

suffers no injury by continuing to pay (but rather benefits by paying in a modified form) that charge to which his lands were always liable. I would, however, suggest, that by way of benefiting the occupying tenant, who alone is now liable to church rates, that he should be relieved from them, by establishing a per centage (like a receiver's fee) out of the clerical land tax, and the sum thus raised should be apportioned by commissioners in each diocese; and thus all demands upon land would centre in one tax, managed by officers invested with sufficient powers. Each Clergyman should for his life receive an income proportioned to that he now enjoys, but in future a more equitable distribution of its property would be for the benefit of the Church. I must add, that whatever may be determined on in the way of legislation should be immediately carried into effect, and rendered operative before the next harvest, as the Clergy in many instances have already lost two years' income. If, however, such a measure cannot be passed this session, common justice would require that the Clergy should be supported in recovering what is yet, in law, considered to be their maintenance. The right, without the remedy, is all that now remains to them; and this surely is a state of things which the wisdom and justice of the Legislature can never suffer to continue. To meet the combination so systematically arranged against them, additional powers in respect of property concealed, or illegally assigned to others to avoid distress, are necessary; or a temporary remedy similar to that given by the Irish Parliament, when, in 1786 or 1787, the property

of the Church was assailed; and, again, an Act something similar was passed to meet the emergency of the case, the year of the Rebellion, in 1798. Upon the whole, I see no effectual remedy but that above suggested, of *a land tax in lieu of Tithe and all church taxes;* and I am confident that nothing but such a commutation will give any thing like a measure of right and justice to the several parties interested in the settlement of this important and long-agitated question.

I have the honour, &c.

(Signed) R. B. Bernard,
Dean of Leighlin.

To His Grace the Archbishop of Dublin,
&c. &c. &c.

P.S.—Since writing the above, a plan has been suggested to me by some landed proprietors, who would prefer giving up portions of their land to the Clergy, rather than having to pay a land tax, which they seem to think it would be difficult for them to collect from their tenants. To this plan I cordially assent.

Is there a general objection felt on the part of the Clergy to the commutation of Tithe for land?

I have found it in many instances; but in some the contrary; and many who were at first averse to commutation seemed willing to accept it, if accompanied by some plan for giving to them their arrears. Such a plan they considered,

not only a present relief, but an assurance of the good intentions of Government. I have found a frequent opinion that it would at once overawe in many instances the opposers of Tithe, and conciliate those of the Clergy who are suffering, and who consider themselves aggrieved by Government, and distrust its designs. But I must say, that in a good many instances, perhaps in the majority of instances, I have still heard objections against the commutation for land, founded on a view of the different natures of land and of Tithes, which I am convinced is altogether erroneous: and the erroneousness of which I think might without much difficulty be explained. They suppose land to be a less permanent kind of property than Tithes; whereas I consider it to be more so.

Do you consider the rent of land to be a more advantageous provision for the Clergy than Tithe?

Very much so. I have heard persons, not deficient in intelligence, express an apprehension that if Tithes were commuted for land, the Clergy might hereafter not be able, in the progress of national wealth, to maintain their present place

in society. But this proceeds from a view which I conceive is just the reverse of the truth. As national wealth increases, Tithe property, generally speaking, diminishes in its relative value, as compared with land. In a new country Tithe may greatly exceed rent; indeed in many young colonies uncleared land will fetch absolutely no rent at all. And there are probably many districts in which an acre of land, whose gross produce we will say is worth 50*s.*, might be rented for 2*s.* 6*d.*, subject to a payment of Tithe (supposing Tithe established there,) which would of course be double the rent; there would remain 42*s.* 6*d.* for the expenses and farmers' profit. Now, if we suppose the gross produce of this land to become of the value of 100*s.*, through the increase of population and the construction of roads, &c., while by improvement in agricultural skill and implements, and diminution of the wages of labour, the expense of cultivation remained the same, the result would be (supposing no unoccupied land to remain in the country) an enormous disproportion between rent and Tithes; for the farmer would be content to receive, as before, (since if he was not, others

would be,) 42*s.* 6*d.* for his expenses and profits. The Tithe would be 10*s.*, only *double* of what it was before, and the remaining 47*s.* 6*d.* would go to the landlord as rent, which would consequently be increased *nineteen* times. This instance may serve to explain my meaning as to the comparative tendency to increase of Tithes and of Rent. It may be answered that this reasoning applies only so far as the increased value of the produce is not caused by increased expenditure. Garden ground, it may be said, in the neighbourhood of a large town, though letting for a high rent, will often yield, especially through the aid of artificial heat and other expensive processes, a gross produce of which the actual tenth would far exceed the rent. I will not deny that in some (though I apprehend few) instances the Tithe actually paid may approach to, or even exceed the rent; but in most cases of highly cultivated ground, I have found that a fallacy is very apt to prevail in the computation of the comparative value of Rent and Tithe.* Rent is always computed according to

* It is to be observed, then, that the word "Tithe" is occasionally used to denote each of three (often very different)

what the landlord *actually receives,* or might obtain; whereas Tithe is often computed as the actual tenth of the gross produce, even in cases where nothing approaching to that either is or possibly could be obtained. In many cases of very expensive cultivation, the tithe owner (however covetous) must, from regard to his own interest, be content with much less than a tenth; because if he were to insist on a full tenth, that high cultivation would cease to be profitable, and would be abandoned. The Tithe of nursery grounds in the parish of Kensington is half a guinea an acre; the gross annual value of the produce of each acre must far exceed five guineas; in all probability it exceeds one hundred guineas. Indeed I am convinced, that, in

things; the confusion of which with each other leads to innumerable fallacies and mistakes: 1st, the *tenth of the actual produce* of the land at any given time: this far exceeds in many cases of expensive cultivation the 2d, which is *the utmost that could be permanently obtained* by the tithe-owner, supposing him to have no object but to secure the largest income he could collect. This again, in most cases, far exceeds the 3d, which is, the amount that the tithe-owner is *in fact content to accept.* Perhaps ten guineas per acre, two guineas, and half a guinea, might, in respect of some nursery grounds, express these three amounts respectively.

the majority of instances at least, the tendency of Tithes, even if estimated according to the utmost that can actually be obtained, is to diminish in value as compared with rent in the progress of wealth.

The circumstance which probably has chiefly contributed to keep this tendency out of sight is, that in a great many instances land has been *subdivided,* while livings have not. The incumbent therefore of a given parish shall not be much worse off, as compared with the neighbouring land owners, than the incumbent of the same parish three hundred years ago; but then these land owners shall be perhaps three or four times more numerous, and all the parishioners increased in proportion. And indeed it is one great additional evil of the endowment of Tithes, that the provision for the maintenance of the Clergy diminishes in many instances precisely in proportion as the call for clerical labour increases. Several of the livings near large cities, for example, were formerly worth more than double their present value, when much of the land which is now covered with houses, consisted of corn fields.

According to your Grace's knowledge and experience, are the landed properties of colleges managed pretty beneficially for the parties interested, and for the community at large?

I have had experience of only one college, which I have had reason to believe is in some respects better managed than the average; but from all I can learn it appears to me that they are much better managed than those belonging to a corporation sole; I mean than in the case where the endowment is in the hands of a single individual who has a life interest, and only a life interest, in it, and has nothing to do with the appointment of his successor.

Are they as well managed as the property of individuals?

Not so as to produce the same absolute rent, I should think, in any instance; but I should think that upon the whole the lands in most instances that have come under my knowledge are not worse cultivated, nor the people that live upon them, either as farmers or as labourers, less happy; and the charity schools and hospitals, &c., that are upon them or connected with

them, are supported, I should say, in many instances with more liberality than if they were in the hands of individuals. But I have no doubt that the rent paid to those colleges has in all instances fallen short of the rent which would have been paid to individuals.

Is not the system of good management of college properties of very recent date?

I believe that great improvements have taken place in it of late years; but the improvement has chiefly consisted in making the lands more productive to the colleges. It has been increase of rent, not increase of produce. The complaint has been, not of general neglect of culture, or of the want of any sort of comfort and enjoyment and security in the tenant, as compared with the tenants of individuals, but of a neglect of the interests of the colleges.

What is your Grace's opinion of the result of the Tithe Composition Act?

Of course, from my short residence in Ireland, I speak from report rather than from experience; but the account that is generally given is, in the

first place, as I have already said, that universally the opposition is quite as strong to composition rent as to Tithe, and generally the Clergy have given, as their opinion, that if it had been introduced perhaps earlier, and had been made compulsory and universal, it might have produced good effects; but I have met with very few, if any, who think that it can be of any benefit now that the system of opposition to it is as fully organized as against Tithes.

Then your Grace is not of opinion that the rendering it compulsory now would be a sufficient remedy for the present evil?

I am inclined to think that it is too late. Whether it would ever have had that effect I have not sufficient data to form a judgment, except that such is the opinion of many of the Clergy and of some of the clerical agents.

You have stated that part of the causes which have produced this resistance to Tithes is a belief, upon the one hand, that Government were not secretly adverse to the resistance, and, on the other, that the Clergy were abandoned; do you know of any instance in which application being made to Government for assistance, that

assistance has not been afforded as promptly and as effectually as possible?

They have complained to me in several instances, that the tithe proctors are not protected *from* violence, but rather, as it were, avenged, if they suffer it:—that punishment is inflicted on those that violate the peace, but that the violation of peace is not prevented. Their complaint is that of Tacitus, "Non esse curæ Diis securitatem nostram, esse ultionem." A complainant has often said to me, "I ask for assistance in distraining the cattle for tithe; I am told that the police cannot act in that; they are not allowed; and I send men whom I hire myself, to drive the cattle; they are waylaid and assaulted; the cattle rescued and carried off; and then, when I go to the police, and they receive information, they set off, not in pursuit of the cattle, but of the rioters; and when I point out—"There are the very cows that have been seized and rescued!"—"Oh, we have nothing to do with the cattle: we are only in pursuit of those that violate the peace, and we will punish all those that break the peace." In many instances they have failed, of course, in their attempts to seize

them; in others they have succeeded, and brought them to justice. Now, how far the complaint is reasonable, I have not sufficient personal knowledge to say; but this is a complaint that has often been brought before me.

Can the police be properly or legally employed in the first instance in seizing cattle for Tithe?

Many acknowledge to me that they do not pretend to say that they could, but only that some law should be passed, or some step taken, which should enable them to recover the property. Others have spoken as if they conceived that there was in the Government itself a sort of coldness and backwardness, and a disposition to evade taking strong steps, and giving offence and incurring unpopularity. I speak, however, of men whose minds are evidently under feelings of very strong irritation, who have strong political prejudices, and are smarting under hardship and wrong, and not unlikely, therefore, to lay the blame on the wrong quarter. I beg, however, to be understood, as not speaking of the reasonableness of this feeling, while I think myself bound to give evidence of its existence.

Do you know any facts which can authorize that sort of feeling?

I cannot state any instances in which I can say that the Executive Government have not afforded as much protection as they were bound to do.

Have any instances come to your knowledge in which magistrates have not afforded the protection that was expected?

None have come to my knowledge; but I have heard many stated to which I forbore to give implicit credit, though I am by no means sure of their not being true. For example, I have been told of a magistrate's having said, "I will not put my hand into the fire; I will have nothing to do with it."

Have you any reason to believe that any application made to the Government in Dublin has not been attended to?

On the contrary, I know that offers have been made of a military force, when it should be necessary; but I have heard the reply made, that it was impossible, considering the wide

extent of the resistance that there was, that the number of troops then in Ireland could be present in so many places, and in sufficient numbers, to accomplish the object effectually.

The complaints then have been chiefly directed against the local authorities, and complaints of the police not having been employed in the way most beneficial to the Clergy?

The complaints have been very various and distinct; some have complained of Government, for not having a sufficient number of troops in Ireland; others have complained of them for not increasing the number of yeomanry: and others have thought that the troops were not prompt enough in acting;—that they were marching, as it were, with ropes about their necks, deterred by the fear of clamour from using any vigorous measures. Others have complained of the magistrates. But in respect of the massacre at Knocktopher, which has excited so much attention, the complaint was not so much that the force was insufficient, as that the men were crippled by the fear of incurring legal penalties if they acted in the manner

which experience has proved to have been absolutely necessary for self-preservation; that they were deterred from firing till the rioters had actually seized the muskets, and wrested them out of their hands.

With respect to the collection of arrears, the plan you proposed was understood to be this, that the Government should give a security to the incumbent to whom those arrears are due, either to the full amount or for a proportion of those arrears, and take upon itself the collection?

Yes; in the form of paper money. That by an issue of exchequer bills or bonds the Government should buy the debt, and then recover it in whatever way they thought best.

Do you apprehend that that demand, if it were known to be merely a substitution for the demand of the Clergy, would be less objected to or less resisted if it were enforced by Government?

I have no doubt it would be less resisted, because there is an opinion most industriously circulated by the resisters of Tithes, that the Government disapproves of Tithes. The hasty and unthinking and uneducated are not very apt

to draw distinctions where they are of the greatest importance. It might be said, for instance, and I dare say will be said in the Irish newspapers, that because I have advocated commutation of Tithes for land I am against Tithes. A sort of general phrase of that kind gets into circulation, and many persons, hearing that I disapprove of Tithes, would understand me to mean that I wish that Tithes should not be paid: and the same is the impression with respect to Government. When it has been said that the present Administration are favourable to an alteration in the system of Tithes, that is understood to mean that the Government is against Tithes; a sort of crude general observation of that kind finds access to the minds of the people, and then the more weak and the ignorant of them believe, and the more crafty and designing circulate the opinion, that Government is in fact favouring the opposition to Tithes. Now I think myself that Tithes are, both in England and in Ireland, especially in Ireland, an inexpedient kind of revenue; but, of course, I should never think that any man is authorized in withholding a just

payment after it has become actually due. There are many laws I should disapprove of, and wish altered, that I think ought to be obeyed; but that is a sort of distinction that the vulgar of any country, and particularly in Ireland, are apt to overlook; and the mere general idea of the Government being against Tithes, affords them great encouragement. But if the decisive step were taken, of the Government purchasing the arrears of Tithes, it would at once disabuse them of that error. It occurred to myself, and on consulting the most intelligent of the Clergy, and those who have acted as agents, I found them concur, that the very offer on the part of the Government would preclude the necessity of accepting it, as soon as the people saw that Government were in earnest in the support of the Clergy, and were able to distinguish completely between the two cases, of wishing to alter the existing law, and of favouring an opposition to that law during its existence. In this opinion, as I said before, the majority of the best informed and most conversant with the character and feelings of the Irish appear to me to concur.

Do you consider that the same objections that might be made to a commutation of tithe into land in England would apply equally, under all the circumstances of their state, to the Clergy in Ireland, if so provided for?

I have no doubt that many of the Clergy in Ireland, who, if they were as well off as those in England, and had as good a security for their revenues at the present time as the Clergy in England, would be opposed to any kind of commutation, would now accept this gladly. Many of them have expressed to me their willingness, if they thought their property was not to be confiscated, to accept any thing they could depend upon, instead of having their lives in perpetual insecurity in endeavouring to obtain any portion of their property, and in many cases obtaining nothing at all.

The question was not with reference merely to the feelings of the Clergy themselves, but with reference to the general expediency of such a provision for the Church; whether the same objections that might be entertained by some persons in England to the Clergy being made landed proprietors, would apply in the same degree to Ireland?

I am not aware of any objection that could

be applied in one country that would not apply to the other.

Supposing it to be, not in the hands of the commissioners, but in the hands of the incumbent, would not the Irish incumbent be in a better situation for the purpose of deriving his income from the land than the English?

I cannot say whether he would be absolutely in a better situation than the English: the exchange would be more for his advantage; he would be much more a gainer by the exchange, considering how obnoxious Tithes are in Ireland to the Roman Catholics.

Would not the circumstance of the great bulk of the population being Roman Catholic, and the circumstance of the limited religious duties which the Clergyman of the Protestant Church in Ireland would have to perform, make his occupation of land less objectionable than it would be in a parish entirely Protestant?

It is possible it might; but I should be sorry that the Clergyman should become, in either country, principally a farmer. In fact, however, if the Clergyman takes his Tithes in kind, he must be occupied in the very worst parts of the business of farming, because he must become a

general small dealer in a great variety of commodities, which seems to me to be, for a Clergyman, the most objectionable part of a farmer's life. He must collect the Tithes from a great many individuals, and then have numerous transactions to sell again the different kinds of produce to different purchasers.

Have you a knowledge of any instances, or have any been stated to you, in which any difficulty has been experienced in obtaining the rent for glebe land being the property of the Church?

I have heard some instances; I have none in the papers before me; but there have been instances mentioned to me in conversation which I cannot precisely detail. There are, however, a vast number of instances in Ireland, in which it is to be easily ascertained that there was glebe land originally belonging to the parish. There are fields actually bearing the name of glebe fields, although they have been irrecoverably alienated. There are now many parishes without any, or with a very small portion of glebe. Many hundred instances have been brought to my knowledge of that alienation. My objections,

however, are very strong against the investment of land in an individual who is a corporation sole, and has a life interest, and no more than a life interest, and has no share in the appointment of his successor. It appears to me to lead to a great deal of loss of church property, and to a great deal of injustice of various kinds.

Was your Grace correctly understood to state that Tithe is ultimately paid by the landlord in all instances, and that it operates solely as a reduction of rent?

I conceive that it operates solely as a reduction of rent, except so far as it may prevent improvements which were not contemplated when the lease was granted, and the rent adjusted. In such cases, the farmer may not extend his cultivation to the high degree of exactness which he otherwise would, and some degree of loss is incurred, or rather some gain prevented.

Is not the Tithe upon land, where the produce has been augmented by the application of increased capital by the tenant, a reduction from the profits of that tenant, during the continuance of his lease?

I apprehend that the tenant does not usually make such improvements, except in cases where

he thinks he is pretty well secured as to a moderate demand of Tithe: but, undoubtedly, there are cases in which he is mistaken; and in those cases, during the continuance of the lease, undoubtedly the Tithe falls in part on the tenant: for a *tenant* may be considered, during the continuance of his lease, as a *landowner*.

I mentioned, however, before, that a common fallacy occurs in computing the comparative value of Tithe and of Rent; that Tithe is usually computed to be the *actual* tenth of the gross produce, in cases not only where it *is not* actually received, through the forbearance and kind feeling of the incumbent, but where it *could not* be received, because the expensive cultivation would be immediately discontinued if it were; whereas Rent is always computed at what might be obtained.

Would not the check which would be thereby given to improved cultivation in consequence of the Tithe, during the occupation of such tenant, prevent the application of capital, and be a check therefore to production?

Without doubt it does operate in that way, to a certain extent; but principally with respect to

those improvements which return a remote profit. Since it is not the interest of the incumbent himself to claim a Tithe when the claim would diminish production, I am inclined to think that in operations completed within a moderate period, the incumbent and the farmer usually come to an arrangement; but even those operations may sometimes be prevented, from the mere apprehension that the claim would be advanced.

In arable land, would not your Grace estimate the value of the Tithe* as about a fifth of the tithe-free rent?

I cannot speak as to that, since it is so extremely variable upon land of different qualities. Even portions of land that produce very nearly the same crops will, in one district, through the natural richness of the soil, and the facility of

* I am uncertain to which of the three senses of the word "tithe" (above explained) this question refers. In any of these senses, it would certainly be *possible*, by examining every parish in the Empire, to obtain an *average;* and by the same means we might ascertain the average *rent of an acre of land;* but, in either case, we should be nothing the wiser, for any practical purpose.

obtaining manure, &c., produce these crops at so much less expense than in another, that the *gross* produce of the two districts will be far more nearly on a level than the *net* produce, on which last depends the rent to be obtained.

Your Grace observed that the church cess was equally objectionable to the landholders with Tithe; have you seen any of the printed forms demanding church cess that are distributed to the Catholic parishioners by the Protestant churchwardens in the diocese of Dublin?

No, I do not think I have seen any. I have conversed upon the subject with several of my Clergy, but I do not recollect having seen any printed forms.

You have stated that there is considerable opposition to the payment of Tithe in the hands of lay impropriators; would you include, in the relief you propose to extend to the Clergy, the same measure to be adopted with regard to the holders of lay Tithes?

I should be apt to say (so far as I have considered that point) that they must be left to themselves to make their own bargain, if they found Tithe an inconvenient kind of holding.

Do you not conceive, that if the kind of measure you

have suggested were adopted with respect to clerical Tithes, and Tithe were to be so far extinguished, that the objection to the payment of lay Tithe would be very considerably increased?

I think very likely it might; and might probably lead to the same result,—an arrangement between the holder and the payer for redeeming the Tithe. The chief difficulty of arranging it, in the case of the *Clergy*, is, that *they*, being merely tenants for life, of course cannot make a bargain which shall affect their successors. This inconvenience must be remedied, either in the way I have proposed, or by some similar contrivance, so as to secure the permanency of the endowment. But a lay impropriator may sell or lease his Tithes, like any other property.

Would you extend the arrangement you have proposed to the Land as well as to the Tithes?

I am convinced of the utter inexpediency of leaving any endowment in land in the hands of a single individual, who has himself a life interest, and only a life interest, in it. In the first place, he is exposed to a strong temptation to seek for his own immediate benefit at the

expense of a much greater injury to his successors.* The present system of letting the bishop's lands in Ireland is an instance of this; and when such a system has once been begun, others, who never would have thought of introducing it, are forced to continue it in self-defence.

Moreover, a person who enters upon any preferment, especially if vacated by the death of his predecessor, will often be able to obtain only a very imperfect and confused knowledge of the state of the revenues of the benefice or see.

* Some of my readers may need to be informed that this system is, to renew (viz. a twenty-one years' lease) every year; so that there is seldom a less term than twenty years to run. Under such a system accordingly, when there is any probability of the death or translation of the ecclesiastical landlord, it is clearly his interest to accept,—and the tenant seldom fails to offer (declining to renew otherwise)—a grossly inadequate renewal-fine. If these terms are not accepted, and a renewal does not take place, it is then given out that the bishop is "running his life against the lease." But the proper sense of this expression, viz. the ecclesiastical landlord refusing to renew on *equitable* terms, and *choosing* to take his chance of the lease running out in his lifetime, is a transaction which, as far as I can learn, never takes place; and, indeed, is so contrary to his own interest, as to be almost a moral impossibility.

Advantage will often be taken of this to encroach upon its lands or other property; and when maps or other documents are wanting, or are imperfect, as is often the case, church property is often irrecoverably lost; and in other cases, where it might be recovered by legal means, the incumbent is frequently deterred from resorting to these by a dread of law expenses; expenses much less than the value of the land in fee, yet greater than his life interest in it. Accordingly, I have ascertained that there are many hundred parishes in Ireland, in which portions of land actually exist, bearing the very title of glebe land, yet irrecoverably lost to the Church. There are many persons, I am aware, who do not regret the impoverishment of the Church, and would even gladly see a further portion of its endowments withdrawn, and appropriated to other national purposes; but they should remember that this spoliation of the Church by individuals, confers no benefit whatever on the Public, and only holds out a bounty upon fraud. I would, therefore, place all church endowments, without exception, in the hands of boards of commissioners, to be administered by them as trustees.

With reference to the letters your Grace read from Mr. Hardy and Dr. Bernard, did you mean to be understood to produce those letters in confirmation of the opinions you expressed?

I do not mean that I coincide with them in detail, but I referred to them as expressing a general coincidence as to the main outline of my views.

Are not these two opinions in themselves distinct, Mr. Hardy proposing that the first step to be taken should be to make the composition compulsory, and to put it upon land, and then an ultimate commutation for land in the hands of the individual occupier; and is not Dr. Bernard's opinion that the commutation should be for an acreable land tax, and not for land?

Yes; the coincidence I referred to was their both being desirous that some alteration of the existing system should take place;—that in one way or another the tithe system should be done away.

Is the plan that your Grace recommends one which you recommend as your own, without any reference to the opinions of the Clergy?

Without any reference to those particular persons. I do not say "without reference to the

opinions of the Clergy," because I have consulted several of them upon this subject.

Does your Grace mean to extend the power of the commissioners you propose to establish, generally to all the landed property of the Church?

I should think it desirable that it should extend to the whole. If it applied only to the incumbents of livings it would be some relief, but I should prefer extending it to the whole.

Your Grace has stated that the Clergy have found some difficulty in collecting the rents of their glebe lands; have you heard more objections to pay the rent of glebe lands to the Clergy than to pay rent to lay landlords?

I think I have heard more objections to glebe, than to other rent; objections to payments of any kind to the Clergy as Clergy; but the principal objection is to Tithes.

Is not the resistance to the payment of them not as Clergy but as landholders?

I cannot say to what degree the resistance may have been greater or less to other landlords than to them; I have heard complaints, but I

have not been able to ascertain precisely the extent to which it has proceeded with respect to either; but whether resistance has been made to the payment of rent of glebe, in instances where no resistance has been made to the payment of rent to lay-landlords, I cannot say.

If the resistance to the payment of rent to the Clergyman for the glebe is now only on the same footing as the resistance to pay rent to the landlord, what advantage would there be in taking from the Clergyman the possession of his glebe land?

The reasons I have mentioned are those that have principally operated upon my mind; the objections, I mean, which I pointed out as lying against the system of vesting endowments in an *individual who has a life interest only* in the property.

Would not a compulsory enforcement of the composition be a necessary preliminary even to your Grace's plan, in order to ascertain the proportion that ought to be paid to each Clergyman out of the body of the church land and Tithe, which would be placed, according to your plan, in the hands of commissioners?

I should think that probably some such mode of computing the values of different livings

would be the best way in which it could be effected.

Is there any probability of your Grace's plan being generally effected, so as to avoid the necessity of collecting in the mean time from the tenants or from the landlords whatever sum the composition may amount to?

My immediate step would be, in each district, (archdeaconry or diocese, or whatever might be thought fit,) to transfer all the church property at once, as it is, into the hands of the board; and that they should then proceed to get rid of Tithes, where they think it advisable, according to the most convenient mode they could devise, and as gradually as might be wished.

Die Veneris, 3° Februarii 1832.

In your Lordship's last examination you referred to certain grounds which had satisfied you as to the inexpediency of Tithe as a mode of endowment for the Clergy; have you any further ground which you wish to state as the foundation of your opinion upon that subject?

There are some additional considerations which have long since occurred to my mind in

support of that opinion. In the first place, an association is created between the ideas of *religion*, and compulsory *payment*, most injurious to the minds of the parishioners. It is true that the farmer *pays*, only in the sense in which a man pays an annuity charged on an estate left to him; and that his landlord allows for Tithes in the rent: but it is equally true, that during the continuance of the lease, whatever he can succeed in withdrawing from the minister by flattery, by deceit, or by intimidation, goes into (or rather, remains in) his own purse;* for when I speak of Tithe falling on the landlord, it should be observed that during the current lease I regard the tenant as being, to all practical purposes, the landlord; it is he who is burdened by any augmentation, and benefited by any diminution of the Tithes, and he is therefore tempted to feel and call a grievous burden whatever he cannot succeed in withholding from the right owner; he is tempted, in short, to hate the minister if

* Hence it has been justly observed, that tithe-property is peculiarly liable to spoliation; because there is a *precise and definite* object to tempt the cupidity of each particular tithe-payer;—the *division of the spoil* is, as it were, *ready made.*

he cannot succeed in defrauding him, and to despise him if he does. It will be remembered that I am not bringing a charge against individuals, but against the tendency of the system.

Secondly, an incumbent, who may be in many respects different from what a Christian minister should be, but who, from indolence, ignorance, timidity, or any other cause, accepts a grossly inadequate composition, is likely to be more popular than, perhaps, a successor who may be a model for pastors, but who will not, or cannot, perhaps, in justice to his family, afford to forego his just claim. This must be not only a hardship to the individual, but a great detriment to the cause of religion.

Thirdly, the existing system leaves an opening for multifarious frauds: for instance, a man is presented to a living by the 'squire of the parish, on an understanding that he is to accept such and such a composition; the landowner lets his land tithe free, paying himself, perhaps, less than half the value of the Tithes; and the incumbent (as Paley observes) not only buys the living, but robs the succession to pay for it. Again—a Clergyman is leading a scandalous life,

and several of the parishioners are disposed to present him; but they are almost all of them tenants of one great proprietor, who, for good and weighty reasons, shuts his eyes to every such representation, and will not allow any complaints to be made. How many cases of this kind have occurred, I cannot of course pronounce; but one has come under my own observation. Again—I have known an instance of an incumbent compelled to take a very inadequate composition, by a threat from the sole proprietor of planting the whole parish with wood. And a loss, again, is often unavoidably incurred of revenue which fairly belongs to the incumbent, especially of a vicarage: small scattered occupations lying at a great distance from the parsonage are not of unfrequent occurrence to a very considerable amount; and the occupiers know well enough that if the Tithes were to be set out, the expense of collecting them would exceed their worth; they consequently pay just what they please.

Lastly, the trouble and vexation to which an incumbent is often exposed in obtaining even a small part of his due, may be regarded as a serious deduction from his income, since (as

A. Smith observes) every thing of this kind may be estimated at as much money as a man would give to be exempted from it. But this vexation, though a loss to one party, is no gain to the other, except when it gratifies a malignant and spiteful feeling.

Do not all the circumstances your Lordship has just stated apply much more strongly to a case in which the great bulk of the tithe-payers are of a different religion to the tithe-receivers, and therefore more prone to that species of opposition which you have described?

I should think that in most respects all those evils are greatly increased. In one respect it may be said that they are of less consequence, as far as individuals of a different religion are concerned; because, whether he accepts a small or a large composition, or even whether he conducts himself well or ill, will make (it may be said) no difference in his moral influence over the Roman Catholics, who, at all events, are not under his ministry. At the same time I am not sure how far he may not be prevented by the circumstances which I have been detailing, from conveying to them some degree of religious, or, at least, of moral instruction. There is no

saying how much influence a Protestant Clergyman, if there is no obstacle in his way, may have over parishioners, even of another persuasion, who do not forsake their church, but nevertheless may listen to his inculcation of those moral duties which every form of Christianity would alike enable him to inculcate, if they have no extraneous causes of prejudice against him.

You stated an opinion, in your former examination, that Tithe falls upon Rent; are you of opinion, then, that the landlord is not able to remunerate himself for that charge by the increased price of produce arising out of it?

I believe that when Tithes have long existed they have no influence on the price of corn.*

* It is incalculable how much confusion of thought pervades the reasonings of most persons on the subject of Tithes. On the one hand, I remember some years ago an ingenious and plausible article appearing in a Review, and attracting, at the time, much notice; in which, besides other fallacies, the whole of the writer's reasonings assumed throughout, by implication, that the tithe-owners *consume*, personally, the tenth part of the produce of the land, so as to diminish by one-tenth the whole supply of provisions, &c. in the same manner as if so much corn were annually burned, like the spices said to be destroyed by the Dutch in former times. On

Their effect in this respect appears to me to be no greater than would follow if we suppose the Country in which they exist to have been originally somewhat smaller than it is, or to have had lakes covering certain districts which are actually fertile valleys. If England, again, had been larger than it is—if, for instance, the Godwin Sands were, and always had been, corn-fields, no one will maintain that corn would have been cheaper. We should have had rather more corn absolutely, and a rather larger population, and rather a larger aggregate amount of

the other hand, I have known an intelligent and well-informed man in other respects, urge that the appointment, under the Mosaic Law, of the maintenance of the Levites by Tithes, though it confers no divine right, yet affords a presumption that such a mode of maintenance is convenient and advisable. So it was, no doubt, *in that Country* and age: but to infer that the same must be always and every where advisable, is as rash as it would be to recommend the culture of the vine, olive, and fig-tree in Great Britain, because these flourish in Palestine.

If, when the Israelites settled there, in a country so much too ample for their numbers that there was danger of "the beasts of the field increasing on them," *land* had been allotted as an endowment for the Levites, the case would probably have resembled that of the Clergy-reserves in Upper Canada; patches of useless forest, which of course no one will *rent*, where uncleared land may be bought for next to nothing.

rent; but the price of corn and the rate of rent would have been just what they are. So, if Kent had never existed, the population of England would have been less by the amount of the people in Kent; the total rental of the kingdom would have been less by the rental of Kent; but the price of corn would have been just what it is. Without doubt, if Tithes were suddenly imposed on a country whose population had grown up in their absence, or if they were suddenly removed from a country in which they had previously existed, the price of corn would be affected. So if the people of Kent were to be removed into the remainder of England, and the whole county, with all its corn, immediately sunk into the sea, the price of corn would rise; or if, again, the Godwin Sands were to be suddenly left bare by the sea, in a state fit for immediate cultivation, the price of corn would fall; but by the time the population had adjusted itself to the new state of the supply of corn, the price would again rise to its ordinary level. I apprehend that the opinion that Tithes fall on the consumer is founded on a confusion of the immediate effects of the sudden

imposition of Tithes, or sudden removal of Tithes, with the ultimate and permanent effects of Tithes after they have long existed.*

Have you any means of stating, from the information you have received in Ireland, what are the ultimate objects of those who have taken an active part in promoting the resistance to the payment of Tithes?

The ultimate object of many is, I have no doubt, simply to get rid of the Protestant establishment: some without even a wish, others without a hope, of transferring its revenues to the Roman Catholic Church, but thinking only of gratifying hostile feelings. Others contemplate, or profess to contemplate, the application of these revenues to the establishment of a fund for the relief of the poor; some, perhaps, holding out the prospect of this supposed benefit merely as a lure, in order to induce Protestants to join in the opposition to Tithes; but many, probably, are persons of sincere but mistaken benevolence, who, having never witnessed the effects of the pauper system in England, look only to the bright side of the question, and do not perceive

* See Encyclop. Metrop., Art. Pol. Economy.

the tendency of the system to produce far more distress than it alleviates, by diminishing industry, forethought, and charity, and by degrading the pauper into a condition approaching that of a slave, fed, not according to the value of his exertions, but to his wants, and accordingly impelled to labour only by the fear of punishment. I am convinced that if a fund for providing legal relief for the able-bodied poor could be raised even without robbing the Establishment, or instituting poor-rates,—if, for example, a rich gold mine were discovered in Ireland, and appropriated to that purpose,—the distress in that Country would be increased many fold.

Do those who hold out an expectation of such a provision for the poor do it upon the principle of Church property being liable to it in justice or in law at present, or upon any general opinion they may entertain of the expediency of revising the system of Church property?

From reports of speeches, and other articles in the newspapers, it would appear that some persons have taken the one ground and some the other.

Do many Protestants in Ireland take the former ground; namely, that of the Church property being liable in justice to that charge?

As far as I have observed, (and of course I have seen only a few of those papers and speeches,) that appears to be rather the tone of the Roman Catholic priesthood; and the other ground is chiefly taken by the Protestants.

At the close of your Grace's former examination, in answer to a question, whether there was any probability of your plan being generally effected so as to avoid the necessity of collecting in the mean time from the tenants or from the landlords whatever sum the composition may amount to; you stated that your immediate step would be in each district to transfer all the Church property at once into the hands of the boards, and that they should then proceed to get rid of Tithes according to the most convenient mode, and as gradually as might be wished: how would that proceeding to get rid of Tithes, if done gradually, supersede the necessity of collecting them in the mean time?

Certainly it would not supersede the necessity of collecting in the mean time whatever was due to the Church.

What means do you conceive the boards would have of collecting those Tithes which the incumbent has not?

None that the incumbent has not or might not have given to him.

Then how would the difficulty be removed of getting

over the intermediate time with reference to the present resistance?

I did not propose it as a mode of getting rid of the immediate resistance, which indeed did not exist when the plan first occurred to me; but I apprehend that it *would* tend to diminish the immediate resistance by the prospect held out of placing the Church property upon a system of commutation, if Government would, at the same time, evince a vigorous determination to support the existing rights of the Clergy.

Your Grace would, therefore, think it necessary, that during the time necessary for establishing the plan, Tithe or the composition for Tithe should be fully collected for the benefit of the Clergy?

I must repeat that the whole of my plan was drawn out long before this resistance to Tithes took place, and without any particular reference to Ireland.

Your Grace's plan, therefore, even supposing it fit to be adopted, would not diminish the difficulties in the present state of Ireland on account of the resistance to the payment of Tithes?

No otherwise than so far as the prospect held out of removing the grievance of Tithes, as an

interference, or a supposed interference, with the proper cultivation of the land, might induce those whose minds are irritated by that impression to withdraw their opposition.

Would not the first step in your Grace's plan be, supposing the whole property was placed in the hands of boards, to establish a compulsory composition for Tithes, which would be necessary in order to settle the amount to be paid to each particular incumbent; and would not the ultimate object be the conversion into land of those Tithes so ascertained in money value?

The former part of the plan might, I think, be adopted with great advantage, though the latter were deferred, or even totally rejected. It was not merely with a view to the commutation of Tithe for land that I proposed it, but as beneficial even though no such commutation should take place. If the Tithes were actually collected in kind, I think it would be a great advantage that they should be collected by any one rather than by the clerical incumbent. My first object was to remove all money transactions between the parson and the parishioners; and I think that even if all property remained exactly upon the same footing as it does now, as far as the

question of payment goes, a great step would be gained, if the Clergyman were put upon a footing with the fellow of a college. Some colleges possess Tithes to a considerable amount—if their tithe-payers are refractory, of course they desire them to set out the Tithes in kind; and if any disagreement takes place, it is still between the college and the payers, but not with the individual fellows, who have not the management of the transaction. Much would be gained, in the removal of irritation, by the introduction of a similar system, even if the Tithes remained in kind which now are taken in kind, and were compounded for where they are now compounded for. The Church property, just as it is, might be transferred into the hands of these corporations or boards, and they might then be left to make such arrangements as they found most convenient in each particular instance. One of the great evils of Church property, whether Tithes or land, in the hand of the incumbent, as a corporation sole, is, that he cannot make a permanent lease, or in fact make any durable arrangements, however convenient or even necessary. That would be got over, even

if no other change were made, by having corporations aggregate substituted for corporations sole; they could then be empowered by parliament to bind their successors, which has been attempted in various ways, but I think not in any other safe way.

Do you think that the throwing the burden of the Tithes in the first instance upon the landlord is a necessary ingredient in the success of your plan?

I have not fully considered that point; and probably in Ireland there would be more interests to be considered than in England, and there might be difficulties of detail which the recency of my acquaintance with the nature of Irish holdings makes me unfit to discuss. Land is often let and underlet two or three times over. If any scheme of commutation were adopted, the different interests must be adjusted by the most equitable scheme that parliament could devise, enforced by some compulsory measure, so as to allot to each person a fair compensation; but I am not prepared to enter into the details of such an arrangement. It would, in fact, require a long act of parliament.

Your Grace thinks it necessary that, previous to the establishment of any such plan, means should be found of indemnifying the Clergy for the losses they have sustained hitherto from the non-payment of Tithe; do you limit that to the arrears that now exist, or do you extend it to the arrears that would be incurred previous to the general enforcement of the payment of Tithes which you think would be the probable consequence of placing the whole property in the hands of the boards?

I have contemplated the payment of only the present arrears; but if resistance should continue, and the arrears accumulate after the adoption of the measures which I proposed, further steps must be taken to meet that emergency. But I have already expressed my hope that a prospect of commutation, and an apparent determination on the part of Government to enforce the payment of the present arrears, will bring the tithe-payers to reason. I have already mentioned to the Committee the opinion expressed to me by several of the Clergy who best knew the state of the Country, that the mere offer by Government to purchase the arrears would, in most cases, save them the necessity of availing themselves of it; that the parishioners would come round, if they saw that the

Government was disposed to support them in any effectual manner.

Does it seem probable that if resistance is made to the half-yearly payment of Tithes at present, resistance would not be made to calling in arrears, which would, in some cases, amount to two years' Tithe?

Certainly, resistance would be made if the same parties required payment, and they had only the same means of enforcing it; but I proposed that the demander should be a different person,—the Government, in the character of purchaser of the existing arrears. It has been suggested, from time to time, that Government should purchase all the Tithes, and for ever pay yearly stipends to the ministers, as has been done in some parts of Europe. I was never friendly to such a proposal, and I allude to it now only to show that my proposal of purchasing the existing arrears is not a perfectly new suggestion.

Then your Grace's proposal goes to this, that Government should take upon itself the collection of existing arrears, or the arrears that might accrue before the plan should be put into execution; but that the moment the whole property of the Church should be vested in the

boards, it should be the boards, and the boards alone, that should be charged with the collection of the Tithe?

The boards alone should be charged with the collection, and they should be armed with sufficient powers. Many of my Clergy have stated to me, that the power now enjoyed by the parson is insufficient. If I answer, that the Lord-lieutenant is ready (as I have always found) to do all that the law allows him, they reply, that if the assistance which the present law enables him to give is ineffectual, the law should be altered. Of course they do not agree as to the details of the provisions they propose; one has suggested one plan and one another.

Does not the law which prevents any person from breaking open a padlock to distrain cattle, effectually prevent the distraining of those cattle?

It certainly does so in most instances.

Could either the Boards or the Government effectually distrain those cattle as long as that law exists?

I do not know of any way in which they could. Another contrivance is resorted to, that of turning out their cattle to feed by night, and shutting them up in the daytime; sometimes they

place men upon the neighbouring hills, to watch for those who come to enforce a distress, and give notice by blowing horns.

Is not the law the same with reference to landlords distraining?

I believe so; and I have no doubt they will feel the effects of it before long. If a successful resistance is made to one kind of payment, I think it is almost inevitable that it will be extended to another.

Does your Grace continue to think that your plan would be desirable, notwithstanding the difficulties which must occur between this legislative enactment and its ultimate adoption?

I do not mean to say that there will not be great difficulties, but I do not see how they could be avoided in any other plan.

You have suggested the immediate or the speedy transfer of all ecclesiastical property to corporations in certain districts: do not you apprehend that the same difficulties would exist, if not in an increased degree, with respect to the collection of Tithes, as long as Tithes continued, that now exists with respect to individual Clergymen?

I should think that difficulties might still exist

under the present excited state of men's feelings, even after that transfer should have been made. I did not propose the measure as a sufficient remedy for the existing opposition to Tithes.

For instance, an individual Clergyman is at liberty to accept, and in most instances generally does accept, a considerably less sum than the real value of the Tithes; would a corporation, acting as a trustee, consider itself at liberty to take any thing less than the real estimated value?

That must depend, of course, upon the provisions of the Act. From all I have heard from the Clergy I have consulted, they would be very ready to take what they have hitherto been accustomed to receive, and to be contented with. If the act therefore were so framed as to authorize the corporations to take less than the real tenth of the gross produce, which would be very fair, because the tenth of the gross produce would be often something enormously greater than our ancestors contemplated to be given to the Clergy, I do not think the Clergy would be likely to complain.

Could they possibly exercise the same discretion with regard to lowering their demands that incumbents do?

Of course not the same absolute discretion; and I think in many cases the incumbents have improperly suffered the Church property to be encroached upon. The occurrence of this in some instances, and not in others, would present a difficulty in detail.

Would not the necessity of keeping up a certain standard of payment rather increase than diminish the existing dissatisfaction to the payment of Tithe?

The necessity of adhering to any undeviating standard would create difficulty wherever such a necessity existed; but I do not foresee greater difficulties in the execution of the plan which I have suggested than are constantly encountered and surmounted in the case of *inclosure-bills*, when land is awarded instead of Tithe.

Is there not, in the case of an inclosure, one individual who has to look after his own interest, and who is therefore less likely to accept an inadequate compensation than such a corporation as you propose, who are to manage affairs in which they have themselves no personal interest?

It certainly is the business of the incumbent to look after his own interest; but on the other hand he has often to contend with his inaptitude

for business, and often, with the dread of offending his parishioners, and the fear of impairing his own ministerial usefulness.

You are aware that, in the case of Inclosure Acts, the proportion generally adopted is an eighth of the land: if any rule of that sort were adopted, would it not tend rather to increase the dissatisfaction than to diminish it?

Any undeviating rule must be inconvenient.

Must not a rule of the sort alluded to in the last question establish upon the whole a higher average for the payment of Tithes than at present exists?

If any rule were established likely to occasion too high a demand on the part of the Church, of course some abatement must be made. And I am convinced that the Clergy would, for the most part, find themselves more comfortable if they even received a less amount of income than they at present do.

You are aware that trustees, such as you have proposed, could not take less than the value, unless there was an authority given by Act of Parliament: do you think that the Clergy would be satisfied to leave it to trustees to put a value upon their property?

I am not prepared to say that; but I have met with a great many Clergymen who have

conceived that they should be better off, if not in point of nominal revenue, yet at least in peace and comfort, if some such plan as the one now proposed were adopted. Many of the Clergy in Ireland have told me that they would be very glad to get any thing; since, in the present state of things, they have no chance, except at the risk of their lives, or even with that risk, of obtaining any maintenance at all.

Would not the people of Ireland object just as much to pay the Tithes to the proposed boards as to the individual Clergy?

The prospect of commutation for land would, I trust, diminish their objection to the payment of Tithe in the mean time.

Do not you think the commutation for land in the hands of each individual incumbent may be effected without the machinery of establishing a corporation?

I should much prefer that to Tithes; but I think there is a very great disadvantage in the holding of land by an individual,—a corporation sole,—with a bare life interest, and no voice in the appointment of his successor.

Considering the great objection that is now made to the collection of Tithes, do you think that Church

property can be ever thoroughly secured till that property is commuted for land, and Tithe is forgotten?

I think nothing would conduce so much to its security as commutation for land; it seems to me the more secure and the less troublesome kind of property.

By means of a composition in the first place, and then by corn rent in the next place, and then ultimately by commutation for land; might not that be done without the establishment of a corporation?

I suppose it might be done; but it seems to me that it would be more easily done by means of corporations-aggregate, and would be a better endowment when it was done.

Your Grace will observe that your plan of a corporation would not embrace any provision for the Tithes in the hands of lay impropriators: do you think that any mode of arrangement of the tithe system would be satisfactory unless it embraced the lay impropriators?

I think it would; I do not see the same necessity of interfering with the lay impropriators, since they can help themselves; they can make permanent arrangements. The inability of the clerical tithe owner to do this, is, next to their moral evils, the principal inconvenience of clerical

Tithes. It occasions the necessity of forming a new agreement with every new incumbent; and the farmers often suffer from the very circumstance of a Clergyman having long received much less than his due. When that has been the case for a considerable period, there is a tendency to a rise of rent, not quite equal indeed to the diminution of Tithe, but still bearing some relation to it. A change occurs in the incumbency; a much larger composition for Tithe is required; and the farmer finds himself engaged to pay a rent which, under the altered circumstances of the case, has become excessive. And the misfortune is, that in nine cases out of ten, he casts the blame, not on his own imprudence, or on the exactions of his landlord, or on the carelessness of the former rector, but on the avarice of the new rector; who is in fact the only person perfectly blameless.

I do not mean to infer from all this, that, except by getting rid of the evils and inconveniences which have been mentioned, no advantage would arise from commutation of Tithe; for though, where Tithes have long existed, they do not influence the price of corn, or its abun-

dance in proportion to the number of the people, yet, as I have already said, their removal would unquestionably produce present relief. It would for a time occasion food to be more abundant and cheaper, and would increase the effectual demand for agricultural labour. In the present state of England, this temporary relief might be turned to inestimable advantage; it might be made use of for the purpose of amending both the provisions and the administration of our poor-laws; amendments essential, not merely to the welfare, but almost to the continuance among us of civilized society. But it is to be observed that this relief would in great measure be afforded by the adoption of the first part of my plan; the constituting the different benefices in each district into corporations-aggregate, with powers of leasing for long periods, and of binding themselves and their successors by their contracts. It is the impossibility of doing this that, principally, if not solely, occasions Tithes to interfere with the progress of agriculture. No tax on the mere rent of land has any such effect; nor do Tithes, (as I observed before) when held in fee-simple, differ much from a tax or rent. It

is the interest of the tithe owner to take, and to bind his successor to take, whatever the landholder can afford, (how much soever less than an actual tenth,) rather than impede cultivation, and thus kill the hen that lays the golden eggs. Sufficiently long leases can be granted by an impropriator; and the same could be done by a corporation-aggregate, empowered to grant long leases; though it cannot be done by a rector or vicar under our existing institutions, or under any other safe modification of them that I can think of. It is for this reason that I do not propose legislating in respect to lay impropriators.

Might not that be remedied by giving the Clergy a power of binding their successors for twenty-one years, with the approbation of the bishop?

It has been proposed very frequently; but there have been objections to it stated which have induced those who have thought most of it to consider the plan unadvisable. Without casting any imputations upon the character of individuals, it has been suggested, in answer, that it is each person's interest to find any contrivance for raising an income during his own

time, or gaining some oblique and incidental advantage at the expense of the living.*

Your Grace has said that there is a deficiency in the law for the enforcement of the payment of Tithes: will you be good enough to point out what that deficiency is?

I have not had complaints brought to me of this or that particular defect in the law, but of its general inefficiency.

Is not it rather from the difficulty of carrying into execution the existing laws than any defect in those laws?

A law cannot have a greater defect than the impossibility of carrying it into execution. When applications have been made to the Lord-lieutenant for assistance, the answer has been returned, that he is ready to give them all the assistance the law affords, and that he can do no more. They have said, if that be the case, there ought to be some modification of the law which will render it more effectual. For instance, they have complained that the police are not

* It is sufficiently proved by the example of the see-lands, that while it never can be the interest of a tenant to offer, for the renewal of a lease, *more* than it is worth, it is often the interest of the ecclesiastical landlord to accept much *less*.

authorized to assist them in any way, but merely to proceed against those that break the peace.

Does not the difficulty of enforcing Tithes arise from a conspiracy against Tithes in Ireland?

I do not suppose that any alteration of the law would at once put down the existing resistance; but it might be expedient, as allowing less facility for combining to evade or break it.

Has it occurred to your Grace that there would be great difficulty in carrying into effect any law of that sort?

Certainly; we are beset by difficulties. In a letter which I read upon my last examination, a case was mentioned of a Clergyman who proceeded by law against his parishioners, and obtained a decision in his favour. When the decree was made, he was informed that every means would be resorted to that the law would allow, for finding subterfuges and evading the payment of his claim, and would be defrayed out of a parish purse; and he suggested that there was something defective in the law, though he did not explain precisely what alterations would have made it effectual.

As that would have been an indictable conspiracy, would not the only difficulty have been in convicting the parties of that conspiracy?

That would have been one difficulty.

You stated that no assistance had been afforded to the Clergy in the recovery of their Tithes: is not your Grace aware, that whenever it has been stated to the Government, or to the local authorities, that the persons employed in serving process were in danger, protection was afforded to them in the execution of that duty?

The complaint has been, not so much of the want of protection, as of the want of assistance in carrying off the cattle. The cattle have been distrained, and in their way from one place to another they have been waylaid and rescued wherever an opportunity offered.

Do you know whether in those cases application was made for a force to protect the driving away of cattle?

In some instances I know that the persons employed in effecting a distress have applied for and obtained that assistance; but they have complained that when cattle have been distrained and rescued, and, in searching the villages in pursuit of the offenders, they have seen the cattle which they had actually distrained, and

pointed them out to the police, the answer has been, "We have no right to touch those; we have nothing to do with the cattle; we are in pursuit of the offenders who have broken the peace." I have never heard of any complaint against the police as being unwilling to act in apprehending offenders.

You were understood to say that the Act of Parliament might be so arranged as to give those commissioners the power of reducing the legal demand for Tithe in cases where it might be considered by them expedient to do so?

They certainly must have that power. In cases like those of the nursery grounds near London, where the Tithe actually taken is half a guinea an acre, and the annual gross produce is worth two hundred times as much, it would be absurd to demand a tenth of the gross produce.

Do you think that provisions might be made to guard such a power effectually against abuse?

I think they might be made, though it might not be an easy task. But it seems to me that the benefit of the proposed commutation would be so great that it would be worth purchasing at

the expense of considerable difficulty and a great deal of labour in the details.

Do you think the Clergy would not object to leaving such a power in the hands of a board of that kind?

The most judicious of them that I have consulted, have said that they would be glad to see some plan like that which I have proposed adopted.

Is it not one of the great evils of the present tithe system, that it is very unequally collected, that a contrast often takes place between one parish and another, in consequence of there being too great a relaxation of the demand in one case, and too severe an exercise of the right in another?

That evil occurs even where there is no severity, and when the demand in both parishes is below the legal rate; yet, because one incumbent is *more* lenient than the other, the one taking perhaps half his due, and the other only a third, instead of the man who is paying only half his Tithe returning thanks for it, he murmurs because the other pays still less.

Is it one of the advantages you contemplate by the plan you have proposed, that the church property being

managed upon an uniform principle, those inequalities would be done away with?

I do not hope that the chief benefit of it will be obtained till the commutation for land has been effected. We must expect inequalities even in the amount in different parishes of that commutation; but those inequalities will take place once for all; the people will not be reminded of them year after year; and in time the whole of the burden and grievance, real and imaginary, of Tithes, will be forgotten.

Your Grace was understood to say that the plan you have described was a plan you formed some time ago, without any reference to Ireland?

Without any particular reference to Ireland.

Has your Grace, since you have been in Ireland, considered the means of carrying such a plan into effect there?

I have; but I have not had time to consider sufficiently the peculiar circumstances of the holding of land in Ireland, from which I apprehend there might be more difficulties in the detail, on account of the number of the persons interested in the land; and I dare say there

would be many who would complain, because each of the parties concerned (as in the case of a road or a canal) puts forth his own claim in the strongest possible manner, and clamours loudly in order to get the most he can. It is probable, therefore, that there might thence be particular difficulties in Ireland: but to counterbalance that, I think the measure is more strongly called for in Ireland; I think it is quite as well worth the trouble it would cost, as in England.

With respect to the collection of arrears, has your Grace ever considered the means by which the Government would be able to effect that collection?

Several have occurred to me, but I considered it was rather out of my province to enter into the details of steps to be taken by the executive. I have already remarked, that as it is well known to have been a plan entertained by many statesmen to purchase the Tithes once for all of the Clergy, it is evidently nothing extavagant to propose that they should purchase the existing arrears.

Were those plans proposed in a state of things at all

similar to the present, and where the resistance to Tithe had become so general?

No; nor did I ever approve of such a plan: but it is on account of the existing state of things that I propose the measure, because I think it is necessary to reassure the minds of the friends of the Establishment, and indeed to satisfy both parties, of the determination of Government to put down lawless violence, and secure to the creditor his just debt. It is not a mere question of Tithe or no Tithe, but of Government or no Government.

Have you ever considered the amount of force that would be required to be put into the hands of the Government for such a purpose, and the manner in which it must be subdivided?

It seems to me, that the resistance would be very much lessened, and would in a great many districts be entirely done away, when it was once understood that it was the determination of Government so to proceed. There is a strong feeling in many parts of Ireland that the Government are, as it were, by-standers, leaving the Clergy to recover their Tithes as they can, and that they care very little which party succeeds;—

that the Clergy have the laws, and are to make the best of them, and get their Tithes as they can. And in many instances they have a sort of general impression that Government is against Tithes; which has arisen, I apprehend, from the idea that Government is favourable to a commutation of Tithes. This is as gross a blunder as if the contemplation of an alteration in the law had been equivalent to a sanction of the breaking the law;—as if the actual power of the existing parliament, for instance, was supposed to be destroyed by the proposal of a reformed parliament. But still that sort of confusion of thought does exist in people's minds; and I think the removal of that, by evincing a determination in Government to use effectual means for securing their property, and making the arrears a government-debt, would put down opposition in most instances. I mean, that many, as soon as they found that Government had transferred the debt to themselves, would come to terms.

Has your Grace ascertained, with a view to the resistance that might be continued, what would be the extent of force that would be required, and the manner of employing it, and the extent to which it must be subdivided?

It must depend upon the extent of the resistance, which in fact has extended, since I left Ireland, to many parts where it did not before exist. If it were to extend much more widely, I cannot of course pretend to say what amount of force would be necessary to put it down, and how far it might be necessary to call in other aids than the regular troops.

Has not the prompt interference of Government, wherever it has been called upon to enforce the law, had any effect in removing the impression which your Grace states to prevail so unfortunately with respect to the feeling on the part of the executive power?

I should hope that it has in some instances; but notwithstanding that, I have seen complaints actually in the papers of the atrocious conduct of some soldiers, in daring to purchase any cattle that were branded as tithe cattle, as if open to censure from Government for so doing. There is a feeling of the kind I have mentioned among many, both of the one party and of the other. If the friends of the Establishment themselves think that Government intends to favour the lawless demands of the resisters to Tithes, it is certainly, I should think, not prudent in them to

put forth that impression, and thus to strengthen the persuasion which encourages the opponents in that resistance: still I cannot but say that it is done to a considerable extent.

Does not that impression appear to have been created by publications in newspapers?

I think the publications in newspapers are partly the cause and partly the effect.

Is it not the fact, however, that the Government, whenever applied to, have always furnished the necessary force, as far as they were able to do so?

Of course the Government has not been enabled in every instance to send troops with sufficient promptitude; but no instance has come to my knowledge of their refusing to make all the force they had available to the utmost extent.

Are you aware of any other means which the Government could have used, under the existing law, in order to counteract the unfortunate impression which you state to have gone abroad?

In many places I understand that applications have been made to employ the yeomanry; stating that the military were insufficient, and

that there were many persons ready to recruit the numbers of the yeomanry, and only wanting a supply of arms.

Have you had any opportunity of observing the effect of employing the yeomanry?

I can only speak from report upon that subject: but it is a measure I should very much deprecate, if any other effectual means could be resorted to; because, if a contest takes place between the regular soldiers and the rioters, a good deal of bloodshed indeed might ensue, but afterwards, when the country becomes tranquillized, those soldiers are removed, and the feeling in a great measure subsides; whereas, if those employed to put down the rioters are persons living in the neighbourhood, the feelings of the people, from all I can collect respecting the character of the lower orders of Irish, are such, that they will cherish the most rancorous spirit of revenge, not only against the individuals who have been instrumental in putting to death any relations or connexions of theirs, but even against the most distant connexions of those individuals. In fact, I know no civil war that seems to me so

dreadful as that in which the inhabitants of the same neighbourhood are employed against each other. If, therefore, resistance could be put down by the regular troops from any distant parts, it would be far preferable.

Do you contemplate in your arrangement that the same gross amount of Tithes should be levied as at present?

I had not contemplated any difference in amount; my attention had been confined to an alteration in the mode of payment.

You do not mean, then, that any alteration should take place in the amount of incomes attached to the several benefices?

It was not part of my contemplation, but I am not prepared to say that should not take place.

You do not contemplate that any alteration should take place of the duties and labours to be performed by the several incumbents?

I have not taken that branch of the subject into consideration, but I am not prepared to say that it should not be.

You have alluded to an impression that has gone abroad, that the Government do not give that assistance

to the Clergy which they ought to do in the collection of their Tithes: do you think the Clergy have any more right to require the assistance of the Government in the collection of their Tithes than the landlords have in the collection of their rent?

Not the least; nor do I understand that they have ever put forth themselves any stronger claim than every creditor has on his debtor.

Have you ever had any difficulty in the collection of the Tithes attached to the see of Dublin?

I have collected so very small a quantity, if any, that I can scarcely speak. I have not had any difficulty; but it is a mere trifle that I have received.

Is not the income attached to the see of Dublin chiefly from church land?

It is.

Does your Grace know whether your predecessor experienced any difficulty in collecting those Tithes?

I have not heard that he did.

It appears from the return to the House of Commons in 1824, that the number of acres attached to the see of Dublin was 28,781?

That is a higher estimate by a great deal than I have ever seen; but having been so short a

time there, I am very little acquainted with the property. Mr. Palmer, who has been summoned before the Committee, is my agent, and is of course much better acquainted with the property than I am.

Is your Grace aware at what period in Ireland the church revenue ceased to be divided into four parts; namely, one part given to the Bishop, one to the Clergy, one to the poor, and the other to the building and repairing of churches?

I am not aware of the existence of any such division.

Are you not aware, that up to the period of the Reformation that division took place?

I never heard of it. I am, however, but little acquainted with the circumstances of the Ecclesiastical History of Ireland.

Can you state the number of Protestant communicants of the Church of England in the see of Dublin?

I have had returns of the Protestant communicants; but I do not consider that as at all affording a fair ground for estimating the proportion of Protestants; the numbers of those who attend the communion regularly, of those

who attend irregularly, and of those who neglect it altogether, is so extremely variable in different parishes.

Have you ever seen any returns of the proportion that the Presbyterians in the north of Ireland bear to the Church of England?

I have merely heard it spoken of in the course of conversation, but I have never had any exact returns. The usual way which I find has been adopted of estimating the proportion of members of the Church of Ireland has always struck me, and has been acknowledged to me by the Clergy, to be extremely fallacious; that of reckoning by the number of communicants: because there is hardly a Roman Catholic that does not attend mass, whereas a great number of the members of the Establishment do absent themselves, some constantly, and others occasionally, from the communion.

It appears that the calculation of the number of Protestants, in the evidence given by Leslie Foster before the Committee of the House of Commons, was founded upon calculations of the number of children of the Established Church in the Education Report, and they were then estimated at 871,000: do you know what

proportion the Presbyterians bear to those that are attached to the Church of England in Ireland?

I do not; my own diocese has but a small proportion of them, and I have not made any particular inquiries, as I have had more than enough occupation in ascertaining the circumstances of my own diocese.

Have you had any return of the number of beneficed Clergy, with reference to the number of Protestants in the diocese?

I have some such documents, but not with me. I have returns of all the beneficed Clergy, and I have seen returns of the population; but the proportion of Protestants I have not been able to ascertain with any degree of certainty. I should mention, however, one circumstance; that, to my knowledge, there are a great number of nominal Roman Catholics who receive not a little religious instruction from the Protestant Clergyman. In some parishes there are many Roman Catholics, in others very few, and in others none at all, that enjoy this advantage. The Roman Catholic children are, in many schools, taught, by the Clergymen of the Esta-

blishment, though not the Church of England Catechism, nor any points of doctrine that might raise scruples in their minds; but still they derive benefit from his instructions in explaining those parts of Scripture which do not lead to controversial points: I have been a witness of that myself. I mention this, because it might be supposed that the Clergyman of the Establishment is of no benefit at all to any Roman Catholic, under any circumstances; and I have ascertained the contrary.

With reference to the collection of Tithes by the police; has it ever been pointed out to you that there is an Act of Parliament, of 7 & 8 Geo. IV., which expressly prevents the police from interfering in the collection of Tithes?

I know perfectly well that they are not authorized by law to do so; and I believe that is generally understood; but this, it is urged, shows that either the law or the system pursued should be altered.

Then what is required of the Government is to have a new law upon the subject?

That has been proposed by several that have made complaints to me.

Are there any parishes in your Grace's diocese in which there are no churches at all?

There are several benefices, consisting of three or four parishes united, with only one church; there are also some single parishes without any church.

Are the people in those instances obliged to attend divine service in the neighbouring parish?

Yes; or divine service is performed in a barn or in a school-house; several instances of that have come to my knowledge: and, in other cases, means are in the course of being used for building a church.

Do you know, in those parishes, what proportion the Protestants bear to the Catholics?

It is usually where there is a small Protestant population that the people are destitute of a church; but frequently I have known ministers have a great deal to do, nevertheless, from their Protestant parishioners being scattered about in extensive mountain districts.

Is it intended to build churches in those parishes where none exist at present?

In several there are actually churches in progress; and in others they are intended.

Is that without reference to the proportions of the Catholic and Protestant population?

It is only where they expect that there will be a congregation enough to make it worth while, and the want is found to be pressing. In other cases they are usually left to resort to the neighbouring church.

What amount of congregation would be sufficient to authorize the building of a church?

I have never had that stated to me. In some instances a very small and cheap church has been proposed; sometimes a church has been built in one parish, in which there has been a small population, and yet a considerable congregation has attended from other parishes, so situated as to be enabled to resort to it with convenience.

Has your Grace any means of judging of the correctness of a statement that has been made, that wherever churches have been built, Protestant congregations have been found?

I have understood that frequently that has

taken place, where it was not expected that a congregation would have been found: my experience has not been long enough to speak from my own knowledge; but I have heard this stated in many instances, where I have had every reason to believe it true.

Your Grace has said that the Catholic parishioners, in some instances, receive religious instruction from the Protestant Clergymen: has your Grace opportunities of knowing in what light the Protestant Clergy generally are regarded by their Roman Catholic parishioners, independently of the present excitement which is produced by this question of Tithe?

I have been very much struck by dissimilarities in that respect, which I have been at a loss to account for. Much, I imagine, must depend upon the character, not only of the Protestant Clergyman, but also of the Roman Catholic priest; for I have known instances of different parishes, not far from Dublin, in each of which there shall have been a serious and active, and, as far as I have been able to judge, a judicious and well-conducted minister of the Establishment; in one of them, all the Roman Catholic children shall have been removed from his

schools, through the influence of the priest; in another, scarcely any shall have been removed; a great number attend, and the efforts of the priest are either not directed, or are directed unsuccessfully, against his instruction of them,—not, indeed, in the peculiar tenets of the Church of England, but in the knowledge of Scripture generally. It appears to me, that it can only be accounted for, in many instances at least, by a difference in the characters of the Roman Catholic priests; but I am not prepared to say what other causes there may be that occasion the difference, which has often struck me with great surprise. I am in the course of an inquiry respecting that very point; endeavouring, I mean, to ascertain how it comes that the reception of the Clergymen of the Establishment is so very different in different parishes.

Does your Grace understand that it is the general habit of the Clergy of the Establishment, where they have the means, to show personal kindness and charity to the Catholic inhabitants of the parish?

It certainly is, in all cases that have come to my knowledge. In many I have ascertained that they have been liberal in relieving their

wants, without (as far as I have observed) any distinction between Protestant and Roman Catholic.

And that the relief is willingly accepted by the Catholic from the Clergyman of a different persuasion?

I know that it is in general; I am not prepared to say that it has never been objected to.

Does your Grace think, that, supposing the Protestant religion were entirely abolished in parts of Ireland where Roman Catholicism prevails, and its revenues either taken away or transferred to another set of Clergy, that the population of that part of Ireland would suffer by it in point of comfort?

I should be sorry to say any thing derogatory to the character of the Roman Catholic priests; but frequently, where they are of a lower description of men than the ministers of the Establishment, it is possible, that if such persons found themselves not dependent on the conciliation of their parishioners, their conduct might not be so good, in these respects, as that of the ministers of the Establishment. I have scarcely enough knowledge, however, of the Roman Catholic priests to say, decidedly, what their general conduct would be.

If the Protestant Clergy were removed without being replaced at all, would it be a great loss, in a temporal point of view, to those parts of Ireland where there are few or no Protestants?

I should think that in many instances it would deteriorate the condition of the people in respect of civilization; because I have observed a sort of nucleus of civilization, as it were, formed by the house of a Clergyman, who is perhaps the only gentleman within a considerable distance, and frequently the only one at least who takes as much care as many of the Clergy do, in affording instruction, in promoting cleanliness, in encouraging the progress of the arts of life, in improving the domestic habits of the parishioners, and in relieving their bodily wants. All that I personally know upon this subject relates to the Clergy in the immediate neighbourhood of Dublin: of other parts of the country I can in general speak only from report.

Has your Grace heard of any particular occasions of distress in the Country, in which the Clergy of the Establishment have been eminently useful to the population by their liberality?

I have heard innumerable instances,—and

those not brought forward boastingly, but which have come to my knowledge incidentally,—of the very great and meritorious exertions of some of the Protestant Clergy; even of many of them who are commonly regarded as the most bigoted against the Romish religion. I have found persons bearing this character, nevertheless active in relieving the temporal wants of Roman Catholics, and liberal to them, in many cases, even beyond their means.

Then does your Grace think that the money expended by Protestant Clergymen in Ireland is expended beneficially to the country?

As far as my experience goes, I should say certainly it is; but I am not able to answer for other dioceses. There may be parts of the country where a very different state of society may prevail; but so far as my own experience of Dublin and its neighbourhood goes, I should certainly say so.

Have not the Catholic priests less means of affording relief than the Protestant Clergy?

I have not been able to ascertain correctly what their general revenues are. I have indeed

heard statements; but I am loth to repeat any thing which I have not had an opportunity of verifying. The reports which have come to me have stated their income a great deal higher than I had any conception of, as from 100*l.* to 600*l.* per annum; but I am totally unable to authenticate those statements.

Have you ever heard that the general average is about 200*l.* to 250*l.* a year?

I have not heard any accounts I could sufficiently rely upon. It should be remembered, however, that they are necessarily single men.

Are you aware that Mr. Leslie Foster estimated that the annual income derived from Tithes by the parochial Clergy of Ireland amounts to 600,000*l.*?

I may have heard that statement, but I do not recollect it.

And that the glebe lands amount to 83,000 acres, valued at 1*l.* an acre?

There are many lands known to have been originally such, but which are not in the possession of the Clergy, though they even bear the title of glebe.

Have not the Protestant Clergy much greater means of being charitable to the people than the Catholic Clergy?

I have already declared my inability to say what the income of the Catholic Clergy is: but I have heard, from sources that I think I can rely upon, that their income has considerably increased of late years; that they receive larger dues than they used to do.

Is there any thing in the nature of the Catholic priesthood that would prevent them from being equally charitable with the Protestant if they had the same means?

I do not know that there is, except cases where they may happen to be worse educated, and a lower description of people.

Is not that mainly to be attributed to the incomes of the parishes being less?

That circumstance would probably conduce to such an effect.

So that if they were in the possession of Tithes, which in fact did once belong to the Roman Catholic Church, to the same amount that the Protestants now enjoy them, they would probably be equally charitable, and equally attentive to the wants of the Irish population?

I have no reason to think that they would not give away as much among their parishioners.

Is not there a Roman Catholic priest in every parish?

More than one, in a good many.*

Your Grace has stated, as one of the objections to Tithes being in the hands of individual incumbents, the jealousies which are created in different parishes on account of the greater or less strictness with which the Tithes are collected?

Not merely between different parishes, but between different individuals in the same parish. If one man happens to have a better crop, and another a worse, some particular year, when there is a general rate of composition laid down, the one who has the worse crop complains of paying at the same rate with his neighbour, though it may not be in itself an exorbitant payment, but perhaps even much below the legal rate.

Do not the same causes of discontent exist, not only between the tenants of different landlords, but between

* It is to be observed, however, that it is common to find one Roman Catholic parish comprising several Protestant parishes held by distinct incumbents.

the different tenants of the same landlord, with respect to the payment of their rent?

Something of the kind may take place.

Is not this therefore equally an objection to the collection of all rent by all persons?

It is an objection to bringing the Clergyman and his parishioners in any way in contact in pecuniary transactions.

Is there any peculiar objection upon this ground in the case of the Clergyman, which does not apply to the case of the landlord and his tenant?

Yes, certainly; because the *tenant,* if he has any cause to complain, when his lease is out may *throw up his farm;* whereas the tithe-payer *must* pay his tithe. The tenant has accepted his lease as a benefit; and he pays a rent which he himself *voluntarily offered* to pay. The case of the tithe-payer is very different. I may complain that my landlord has not abated the rent as he should; but I have originally offered to pay it.

You have stated that in all instances which have fallen within your knowledge, the Government has been ready to afford assistance to individual Clergymen?

I do not mean to say that assistance has always been in fact afforded; for in many instances the military have not arrived in time to do any effectual service.

Do you think that the affording assistance to individuals in the manner you have stated is sufficient to remove from the minds of the people their erroneous impression that Government is not favourable to the collection of Tithes?

If the means taken are not effectual, it is very possible that that which is in reality an unavoidable delay may be interpreted as a designed one; and the successful rioters or tithe subtractors may encourage themselves with the idea that Government does not choose to interfere, in cases where perhaps it was merely that the force could not be sent in time.

Does your Grace think that erroneous impression would be removed in any other manner than by some general determination expressed on the part of Government to put down this resistance, not as applying to individual cases, but as a conspiracy against law?

It seems to me that holds out the fairest prospect of success.

Is your Grace aware that, according to Mr. Leslie

Foster's calculations, grounded upon authentic documents, the average income of the Protestant Clergy arising from Tithe and Glebe does not exceed 382*l.* a year?

I may have seen his calculations; but if I ever did, I have not carried the precise sum in my mind.

Is your Grace aware that, according to the calculations of the same gentleman, the average income of the Roman Catholic Clergy exceeds 150*l.* a year?

I may have seen those computations, but I cannot be sure.

Is it not your Grace's opinion that the Protestant Clergyman requires, at least, twice as large an income as the Roman Catholic Clergyman; the former being allowed to marry, and the latter not?

I should think it would probably make that difference, considering their incomes no greater than has been stated.

Is your Grace aware that the Roman Catholic Clergy in Ireland are altogether dependent upon the Bishop, with respect to their removal from one parish to another?

I think I have understood so.

Is it not your Grace's opinion that it is a great

advantage to the Protestant Church that the Clergy should be, to a greater extent, independent of the Bishops?

To a greater extent than that, certainly.

The fact of the greater income enjoyed by the Protestant Clergyman has been alluded to, with reference to his being married, as giving him a greater claim; is it indispensable that the Protestant Clergyman should be married?

I presume I need not answer that; but I must say, that I consider it of very great advantage to his parishioners, supposing him to be the sort of person that one would wish to see in a parish; and otherwise, whether married or single, he would not do much service there. But if he joins himself to the sort of partner that one would wish, I have usually found that the Clergyman's partner is almost as useful as himself,—that she acts the part of a deaconess, and does many things that he could not do in person. I should generally wish to see my Clergy married; and I think those of them who are most calculated themselves to do service are those who usually find partners of the same description.

Does not the value of that circumstance decrease in proportion as the country is more civilized?

I do not know that there is any degree of civilization in which it would not be very desirable.

Although your Grace does not think that it is absolutely necessary for the Protestant Clergy to marry, are you not of opinion that constrained celibacy leads to evils of the most fearful description?*

Certainly, that is my opinion.†

On the whole, is not the liberty to marry, which, according to the constitution of human nature, leads in

* The question seems to have been this: some members of the Committee seem to have thought that a Protestant Clergyman should be considered—in computing what would be a reasonable income—as a married man, on the ground that he is *permitted* to marry: others, that he should be reckoned as a single man, on the ground that he is *not constrained* to marry. I must say that the former appears to me the more reasonable mode of computation, and the most analogous to our ordinary mode of estimating any one's circumstances. If it be enacted that a certain class of men shall not have an income that will enable them to marry without sinking below the condition of gentlemen, this is virtually to enact that they shall forego either the one or the other of the two things that are thus made incompatible;—that they shall either be single men, or else men inferior to the class of gentry. A profession so circumstanced, therefore, will for the most part, when celibacy is not enforced by law, be filled by men of inferior grade.

† See Note B, at the end of the Evidence.

most instances to marriage, more consistent with the apostolic recommendation?

I am convinced of it.

Are not the landed possessions of the Church of Ireland already very extensive?

If those are to be called possessions of which the right is vested in the Church, they are very extensive; but I believe that much fallacy has originated from the circumstance of the actual revenues enjoyed by the Church being estimated or guessed at with reference to its nominal property. For instance, a statement has been alluded to, which places the lands of the see of Dublin at 28,000 acres; the estimates I have seen make them about 16,000 acres of arable and pasture land, and about 6,000 more of mountain and bog, worth very little indeed. In no instance, however, does the Bishop obtain more (taking rent and fine together), seldom so much as one fifth, oftener one sixth or one seventh, of the real rental. Four fifths and more of the rental go as a profit rent to the layman or other person who holds it under him;

accordingly, it is in a very modified sense that that land can be said to belong to the Church.

Though their extent is very much exaggerated, and the revenue derived from them still more, yet are they not very extensive?

The lands legally vested in the Bishops are very extensive.

Is there any topic of popular attack more frequently or more vehemently urged than the extent of those landed possessions?

It is continually and most vehemently urged, and in many cases attended with the grossest exaggerations, though perhaps unintentional. If, for instance, it be stated broadly, that the Archbishop of Dublin has 28,000 acres, it would be naturally supposed that his wealth would be enormous.

Do not you think that the proposal to add to those landed possessions, by commuting the Tithe for land, would be liable to much odium and unpopularity?

I should wish to see some plan devised of putting the Bishop's lands upon a different footing, so as to avoid the evil that has arisen from vesting land in a corporation sole. The result

of the system of leases for twenty-one years, renewing every year, has been, that though the land is very great, the income derived from it is comparatively small. I conceive that if the lands of the Bishops were properly managed, the same amount of income which they now enjoy might be derived from a much smaller extent of land, and would not, consequently, be open to the same misrepresentation. It appears to me, that there might be an actual division of the estates of each see between the Bishop and the tenants, in proportion to the value of their respective interests; and that the Bishop might release to his tenants the reversion in one portion, on receiving from them a surrender of the leasehold interest in the other part. The objections raised against the great extent of lands held by the Bishops might in this way be diminished.

Do not you think that making so much more land as would be taken in exchange for Tithes inalienable in the hands of perpetual corporations, would be liable to the same objection?

I think there would be many objections to the proposed scheme.

Would not that be a solid objection?

To make more land inalienable would certainly be liable to a solid objection; but the proposed corporations might have powers of sale and exchange, on the terms of investing the purchase money in the purchase of other lands to be held upon the same trusts; and as I formerly remarked that the effect of Tithe is the same as would have resulted from the extent of fertile territory in the country having been originally less than it actually is, it follows that the proposed commutation, by removing Tithe, would virtually be equivalent to the creation of so much new land. Nevertheless, I have no doubt that not only apparent but solid objections to my proposal might be found; but I conceive there are more and weightier objections, both to the existing system and to every other substitute for it that could be devised.

Have you ever considered any advantage that might arise from substituting a corn rent, charged upon the proprietor, instead of the investment in land?

I have considered that plan, and I think it would be an improvement upon the present system.

Do not you think it would be an improvement even upon the plan of investment of land?

I think it would be acceptable for a few years; and then, I have not the least doubt that the next generation, at the latest, would raise a complaint, saying, "It is very hard that the landlords are alone to *pay* the Clergy; they ought, if they are to bear this burden, to be allowed such and such privileges and advantages, in the shape of corn laws or bounties; or the burden ought to be in part taken from them and laid upon other classes of society." It would be quite forgotten, in the course of one or two generations, that they had in fact received an equivalent;—that their lands had been disburdened of the onus of Tithes; and it would be represented, perhaps before the middle of this century, but certainly before the end of it, that the landlords were unjustly burdened by alone paying the Clergy, who were of equal benefit to all classes; and I think the church revenues would in consequence be in great danger; but for the present I think it would be of great advantage.

How would the operation of an arrangement of this

sort affect the interests, as well of the landlords as of the Clergy, if a power were given to the landlords gradually to redeem this rent, charged at a certain number of years' purchase, to be invested in detached lands as glebe land for the different incumbents?

I have contemplated that as one of the modes of proceeding which might be adopted by those district corporations. I think it would be impossible, with any prospect of securing justice, that this should be done by an individual incumbent; but if there were a board, such as I have spoken of, established in each district, that mode might probably be adopted with great advantage.

Does your Grace contemplate the operation of the board you propose to be simply to invest the amount of the Tithes in land for the purpose of supplying glebes to the separate incumbents, or to retain the aggregate amount of Tithe in Ireland constantly in the hands of the board, to distribute to the different incumbents in their proper proportions?

The latter was my intention; but I should prefer the former to the present system.

In this immediate crisis, before the operation you contemplate in the minds of the landlords hereafter shall take place, do you not conceive that the rent-charge

fixed upon the proprietors according to the proportions which would be deduced from the present Composition Act would give immediate and ready facility both to the incumbents and to the present occupiers?

I am hardly prepared to answer that question without more consideration.

Would not the immediate or early extinguishment of Tithes for a corn-rent probably assuage the present irritation that pervades the country?

I should think it would be a means towards that end.

In such a plan, would it not be possible to extinguish the Tithes before any future Tithe to any amount shall have accrued?

As far as I am able, at the first glance of the subject, to speak, I should think so.

The question supposes that an immediate and universal application of the Composition Act should take place; that that should be the basis of the measure of the corn rent; and that a corn rent being fixed so soon as those valuations are made, the Tithes should be forthwith extinguished, and a rent-charge commence; the landlord letting his land from that moment tithe-free?

I wish not to be understood as giving my deliberate opinion, at the moment, on such a

question; but it strikes me that that would be desirable. The sooner Tithe is removed, the sooner we may hope this miserable state of excited feeling to be assuaged.

Does your Grace think it likely that that which may be called prejudice in the landlords hereafter, in the event of their being charged permanently with this rent-charge, would have as dangerous an effect upon the institutions of the country as the present irritation is likely to produce?

I can hardly speak with confidence in respect of any evil which is remote, as compared with one that is near at hand. Probably the danger might in fact be less; but we are very liable to the error of under-estimating a danger which does not immediately press upon us, in comparison of one that is at hand. I think the mode now referred to would put the property of the Church in an insecure position. Still, if there were no other alternative, I would rather incur a more remote than a more immediate danger.

Would not the advantages of the extinguishment of Tithes be more readily obtained by such an arrangement

as has just been suggested than by any other plan your Grace has proposed?

So it seems to me at the moment, supposing such an arrangement to be preliminary to a commutation for land.

Is your Grace aware of the number of years' purchase which is usually paid for a lease of land held under the Bishop?

I cannot say. When I have ascertained any of those points, they have commonly been committed by me to paper; and I have no memoranda of the kind about me. I have intrusted the care of my pecuniary concerns to an agent whom I can fully rely upon both for experience and integrity; and therefore I have not either furnished myself with documents, or burdened my memory with a recollection, of many things of that kind.

Assuming that the boards were formed according to your Grace's suggestion, and were vested with a power of purchasing land, do you see any objection to the purchase of such leases in each diocese, and that leases so purchased should be again granted to the boards in perpetuity, reserving to the diocesan an interest equivalent to what he now has, that is, about one-fifth?

I can see no objection to it; but the idea is new to me, and I should require some hours, perhaps days, to make up my mind decidedly upon it. My present impression is certainly in favour of such a suggestion.

If a Bishop's lease is now usually sold at from fifteen to eighteen years' purchase, would not this give a considerable advantage to such a purchaser, if he would otherwise have had to purchase freehold property which varies from eighteen to twenty-five?

I should think so.

With respect to the boards your Grace proposes to institute, would you give them the full power of entering into a composition with the present tithe-payers?

Yes.

Does not your Grace believe that the mere circumstance of a composition would be so great a relief to the majority of small farmers that it would tend considerably to allay the present excitement?

I rather doubt that; because I have found the opposition now prevailing to be as strong against composition as against Tithe. I formerly stated that I had inquired particularly upon that point.

Did it, to your Grace's knowledge, originate at least in any instances in parishes compounded?

That is more than I can say: it originated in a sort of secret combination, whose results appeared almost simultaneously in several places, and spread rapidly, but irregularly, probably with some reference to the character of the individuals in each parish. I can only say, that from all I have been able to collect, I have not been able to ascertain any difference between the parishes compounded and the parishes not compounded.

Is it not probable that the hope held out of the extinction of Tithe, or of its being collected in a different manner by boards constituted as you have proposed, would tend, in a great measure, to satisfy the minds of the people, and to allay the present irritation?

It would satisfy, I should think, all, in proportion as they are actuated, not by a hatred towards the Protestant Establishment, but by a feeling that they are aggrieved by Tithe as Tithe.

Have you paid any attention to the present state of the archiepiscopal lands in the vicinity of Dublin?

I can speak only from report: but my agent, Mr. Palmer, who is summoned as a witness by the Committee, has taken the most indefatigable pains in collecting all the information he can upon that subject.

You stated you think it would not be advisable to appropriate any part of the present Tithe to a provision for the poor; and that a provision for the poor, generally speaking, would not be a remedy for the present sufferings of the people in Ireland?

I believe it would be a great augmentation of them.

Have you turned in your mind any method of bettering their condition?

I have thought of a great many, to enter into which now would occupy the time of this Committee at great length: but I am convinced that to encourage industry and frugality and forethought among them, by whatever means it can be effected, would be most important; and that providing them with a certainty of relief, on even the lowest scale, whenever they were out of work, would tend to extinguish what there is among them of industry and frugality; in short,

that, with the prospect of such a provision, they would work as little as they could, and lay by nothing.

Is not the present state of mendicancy and wretchedness among the lower orders such as to demand the serious attention of the legislature?

I have made it a great object of my own attention, and have taken an active part in the Mendicity Institution in Dublin, and in other charities; and if it should ever appear to me that the legislature could take any step which would tend to better their condition, of course I shall think it my duty to propose it; but I am not prepared with any such proposal at present.

Are you aware that, notwithstanding the great prevalency of mendicity in Ireland, the savings of a portion at least of the lower orders, as evidenced by the increased amount deposited in the savings' banks, has been latterly considerably increased?

I have every reason to suppose, from what I have heard from various parts of Ireland, and from comparing their present state with what I observed when I was there fourteen years ago, that the condition of the poor in Ireland has

rather improved than deteriorated in that interval; though it is still so much short of what we see in all the best parts or even the tolerable parts of England, that many new comers are apt (erroneously as it appears to me) to think they are in a sinking state. I am quite convinced that a system of poor-rate would throw them back more than any thing that could be devised.

Do you allude to the poor-laws as they operate in this country?

I mean, as poor-laws on our principle must operate in every Country, even if administered as well as that principle will admit.

Do you conceive there might not be some modified plan of poor-rate adopted in Ireland that might be productive of benefit to the country?

The name of poor-law of course might be extended to systems of a very different nature. A great distinction is to be drawn between legal relief of that kind which tends to *increase* the distress that it intends to relieve, and that which has no such tendency. The relief afforded to cripples, idiots, blind, deaf and dumb, does not tend to increase those evils. The relief that is

afforded to mere want, as *want*, tends to increase that want. That is the sort of relief which I deprecate; a relief to those that are in distress but able-bodied.

And you think that any legislative enactment of relief for that purpose would be injurious to industry, forethought, and charity?

Yes; it would tend to make them leave their parents and their children to parish support, instead of attending to them as they now do, and to prevent them from laying by any thing for a time of distress. They would work as little as possible, and get all they could from the parish. I have seen that operate a great deal in England, and I think it would operate with much more rapid and destructive effect in Ireland. But what I have said does not apply to the relief of the blind, the permanently infirm, cripples, idiots, and the like.

Can your Grace state from general opinion whether the calculations of Mr. Leslie Foster are considered to be correct?

I have not been able to collect any account I can rely upon as to the number of the members

of the Church of England; it is extremely difficult, if not impossible, to ascertain their proportion to that of the Roman Catholics, except in very small parishes.

Are those calculations of Mr. Foster's much objected to as incorrect?

I have never heard of any body that has been satisfied with any calculations that have been made with respect to the incomes of the Roman Catholic Clergy; all I can say is, that I have understood from various quarters that they are greater than they used to be.

Do they not vary very much, not only between parish and parish, but between one individual priest and another who may be his successor in the same parish?

I should imagine so; but I have not been able to ascertain any thing satisfactory upon that subject.

Is there not very great church patronage attached to the Irish Bishoprics?*

* The Clerical Almanacs will furnish exact answers to many of the questions asked by the Committee.

I have understood so.

Have not the Bishops the nomination of 1400 benefices out of 2200 ?

That is more than I can answer.

NOTES.

Note A. Page 298.

Few persons would imagine that the revenues of any College at Oxford, Cambridge, or Dublin, would be placed on a more secure or convenient footing by allotting to each Fellow and Scholar, as a Corporation-sole, a separate portion of land, to be let or cultivated by himself. And yet even this course would be free from one of the greatest evils attendant on the present constitution of Church endowments; viz. that of bringing the Clergyman into collision with his own parishioners in pecuniary transactions. Even if no other alteration were made but that of an *exchange* of endowments, so that each minister should be maintained by the Tithes of a different parish from his own, I am convinced even this would be a great improvement.

The measure of vesting the revenues of livings in diocesan boards, was recommended by the Committee of the House of Commons in 1832; and a further extension of the plan was proposed, in the session of 1835, by

the Hon. B. Baring, and was not unfavourably received even by those who thought the adoption of it at that time unadvisable. This extension was, the substitution of *one* board for several, and giving to that the power (on the demise of each incumbent) to re-distribute the revenues according to the wants of the congregations in each district, instead of adhering to the mere territorial divisions.

This appeared to me a most important improvement, considering how unequally the Protestant population of Ireland is distributed. No one can doubt how inefficient, in proportion to its cost, would be the military establishment of any country that should have a distinct endowment for each separate fort and barrack; of which some would in course of time become nearly superfluous, while others were needed in situations where there were no means of supporting them. We should then perhaps be told of a surplus that might be withdrawn from the excessive amount of the military establishment: a *local congestion* (to use a medical illustration) being mistaken for a *general plethora*.

To show how little of attentive consideration many persons have bestowed on the proposal in question, I will observe, that I have actually heard it urged as an *objection* against it, that the property of *Corporations* is seldom managed in the best manner: a strong argument in *favour* of substituting *one* Corporation for the many hundreds now existing, and those the very worst of all Corporations in respect of the management of property,—Corporations-*sole*.

Note B. Page 397.

In expressing this opinion of the system (*an opinion in which many of the most judicious Roman Catholics concur*), I beg to be understood as not meaning to cast any reflection on the character of any individuals. Indeed the evils *directly* arising from the actual profligacy of any individual priest, are by no means what I had principally in my thoughts. Not that any one would maintain either that instances of this are unheard of, or that those which *are* heard of constitute the whole, or the majority, of what actually occur: to estimate the number of offences as only equalling the number of *convictions*, would be most extravagant. But the principal objection in my mind, is, that sort of *general disrepute* which a *compulsory* perpetual celibacy tends to attach to the whole class who are subjected to it, even including those of the most perfect purity. No one can be *sure* that any individual does not repent of the restriction under which he has placed himself; because, if he *does*, he cannot extricate himself from it. And the suspicion of such repentance—a suspicion which, though in fact it may be groundless, he has no means of refuting—is, in such a case as this, of most injurious consequences. Of the numbers of men who live single *by choice*, (including, it should be remembered, the majority of the Armenian

Clergy, who, though *in communion with the Church of Rome*, are allowed to marry,) there are probably very few against whom any suspicion of profligacy lies, except when it is deserved. But the very same men, if living under a system of *compulsory* celibacy, could not have the same security of preserving their reputation free from all suspicion.

I wish these observations to be received by Roman Catholics in the same spirit of candour in which they are offered. If there be no superior virtue in a life of celibacy, it should not be enforced on any: if there be, it must be an enhancement of the virtue that it should be the result of a voluntary resolution made day by day, rather than once for all to bind the agent for ever. Either a priest wishes to marry, or he does not; if he does, it is better he should be permitted: if he does not, it is superfluous, and worse than superfluous, to prohibit him.

A SPEECH

IN THE HOUSE OF LORDS, AUGUST 1, 1833,

ON A BILL

FOR THE REMOVAL OF CERTAIN DISABILITIES FROM HIS MAJESTY'S SUBJECTS OF THE

JEWISH PERSUASION,

WITH

ADDITIONAL REMARKS ON SOME OF THE OBJECTIONS URGED AGAINST THAT MEASURE.

Ἀπόδοτε οὖν τὰ Καίσαρος, Καίσαρι, καὶ τὰ τοῦ Θεοῦ τῷ Θεῷ. Matt. xxii. 21.

PREFACE TO THE FIRST EDITION.

It appears that some well-intentioned persons have been taught to misinterpret the motives of those who supported the Bill lately before Parliament, for removing civil disabilities from His Majesty's subjects of the Jewish persuasion. It has been hastily inferred that the advocates of that measure must have been either wholly indifferent to Christianity, or at least, less strongly attached to it, than their opponents. And it is not unlikely that some of the less-educated portion of the community may even have been led to suppose that the question was as to the superior excellence of the Christian or the Jewish faith; or, as to the degree of intrinsic importance of the differences between the two: in the same manner as some persons, during the agitation of the Roman Catholic question, supposed that to be a question of preference between the Romish and the Protestant faith.

Now every man of candour and good sense, whatever may be his opinion respecting the Bill in question, must wish that such erroneous impressions as these should be

removed; and that, as men of undoubted religious sincerity were to be found among the voters on both sides, so, both should have equal justice. Differences of opinion may exist, as to several points, among sincere Christians; but a Christian spirit—a spirit of candour, courtesy, and charity,—is essential to all who are Christians in any thing more than in name. It is very easy to brand, on the one side, the supporters of the Bill, as lukewarm in religion; or, on the other side, its opponents, as bigoted, or as hypocritical, or as thinking to atone, by standing forward in public as defenders of Christianity, for their neglect of its duties in their private life: but it is not so easy to reconcile rash imputations of this kind, with the prohibition of passing harsh judgments on our brethren.

Since however such censures have been promulgated, I have thought it due both to my own character, and to the cause of truth and justice, to lay before the Public (reprinted from the report in the "Mirror of Parliament,") the reasons which I assigned in the House for voting as I did; especially as the reports in the newspapers were extremely incorrect.

And having had no opportunity, during the debate, of replying, I have subjoined a few remarks on the argumentative portion of what was subsequently urged on the opposite side.

In one point I entirely and heartily concur with several of those who voted against the Bill: I mean in considering the question, chiefly, as one of *principle*. The number, it was admitted, of native British Jews is too

small, to make a concession of their claims a matter of any great direct national importance, either for evil or for good. The chief importance of the question lies in the general principles of legislation which it involves. In taking this view of it, I agree with the opponents of the measure; as I do also in my estimate of the paramount importance of the Christian Religion, and of the duty of legislating in accordance with the true spirit of it. Our difference consists in the one party considering the removal; the other, the imposition or continuance, of the civil disabilities affecting the Jews, to be inconsistent with the spirit of the Gospel.

To me, I confess, the whole question as to the treatment of persons of a different persuasion, seems to have been long ago decided, by our Lord's answer to those who alleged their scruples respecting the submission of men professing the true religion, to the civil government of a heathen prince. "Is it lawful," they inquired, "to give tribute to Cæsar?" Our Lord's answer, "Render to Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's, and to God, the things that are God's," lays down a principle which must surely be as applicable to the case of *fellow-subjects*, as of *rulers*. Cæsar's being an idolater, did not, it seems, impair his right, as a civil governor, to the obedience and the tribute due to him *as* civil governor, so long as his commands did not interfere with the service due to God. Neither therefore can the religious errors of our fellow-citizens impair their rights as citizens, so long as the exercise of these does not prevent *us* from serving God after the dictates of our own conscience.

For, a prince can have but the same claim to the rights of a prince, that a subject has, to those of a subject. The plea of *self-defence*, indeed, may justify our withholding either the one or the other; as in the case of King James II. and his descendants; whose sovereignty seemed incompatible with the rights of their subjects: but no *other* plea can justify our withholding either. It might indeed be more unsafe, but would hardly have been more unjust, for the Jews of old to refuse tribute to a heathen emperor, than for us to refuse, on religious grounds, civil rights to our fellow-subjects, when no case of danger to ourselves from the concession can be made out.

And although anxious that our Jewish fellow-subjects should receive what I regard as justice, I am still more anxious that Christians should manifest a readiness to practise it. Indeed, as far as the immediate object of the Bill is concerned, though it would be a satisfaction to me to think that claims which I consider reasonable have received any effectual support from my efforts, I do not apprehend that the absence of those efforts, even were they more powerful than I can presume to think them, would have materially affected the ultimate result. Most persons, however they may differ as to the *advisableness* of passing the Bill, seem to agree in having little doubt that within a very few years at the latest, if not within one year, it *will* be passed. Accordingly I do not expect (considering that for the next three sessions I shall have no seat in Parliament) that an opportunity will ever again be offered to myself, of advocating the measure.

My anxiety is, that it may not appear to have been carried in despite of all who feel strongly in favour of Christianity:—that it may not be regarded as a measure *forced* upon sincere Christians, in opposition to Christian sentiments and principles; but on the contrary, as the result of a clearer estimate of those principles, and as a just application of the maxim, to "render to Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's, and to God, the things that are God's."

I have been influenced however in no small degree by a desire to lay before the public my sentiments on another most important subject, slightly touched on in the following speech, and rather more fully in the one subjoined:—the anomalous situation in which our Church, considered, simply, as a Religious Society, is placed, in respect of the Legislature, constituted as that Legislature now is.

SPEECH

ON THE

JEWS' RELIEF BILL,

AUGUST 1, 1833.

MY LORDS,

FEELING myself bound in conscience to support this Bill, I feel myself also called upon not to give a silent vote, lest I should be open to misconstruction. Misconstruction, perhaps, I shall, at any rate, encounter from some; but I feel myself bound, as far as I can, to guard against it at the hands of the considerate and candid.

I will not occupy your Lordships' time by protestations of the sincerity of my attachment to Christianity. Such protestations receive, in general, but little credit; and deserve but

little, unless they are borne out by the general conduct of those who make them ; and if they are, I consider them to be superfluous. I will take leave to observe, however, that setting aside all considerations of duty, it is not likely that a Christian Clergyman should be indifferent to the security of the Christian religion—that a prelate of the Establishment should be indifferent to the safety or the credit of the Establishment,—or that a Member of this House would be willingly accessory to the degradation of the Legislature.

I shall offer a very few observations on a part, and a part only, of the objections which have been taken to this Bill. And I shall confine myself to the consideration of *objections,* because it must be admitted, I conceive, that if these are removed, the Bill ought to pass. The presumption is evidently in favour of it ; and the *onus probandi* lies entirely on those who oppose it. The general rule, indeed, is, that the presumption is in favour of any *existing* institution, and that the burden of proof lies on those who call for a change. But in the case of all *restrictions* and *disabilities,* I consider the

rule to be reversed, and the burden of proof to lie on the other side. Disabilities, restrictions, burdens, pains and penalties of various kinds, may sometimes be necessary; but no one will contend that they are good in themselves. I conceive, therefore, that it is not incumbent on those who advocate this Bill, to point out, in the first instance, the advantage of the relief which it proposes to give; but rather to meet the objections that are brought against it; because, if no sufficient reason can be shown for continuing them, it is clear that these and all other restrictions (their only warrant being that of necessity) ought to be removed.

Now the objections which I have heard,—not in this particular debate only, but on other occasions also,—to the removal of the disabilities imposed on the Jews, may be divided into two classes,—those of a purely political character, and those of a religious character. The first class of objections has reference to the Jews, not as a certain body of religionists, but as a distinct Nation, looking forward with a confident hope to an ultimate return to the

Land of their fathers, and having habits of thought, and feelings of patriotic attachment so exclusively confined to their own Race, as to render them incapable of mingling as good citizens on equal terms with any other. On that class of objections, I shall say nothing on the present occasion ; being desirous of addressing this House as seldom as possible on questions purely political. I shall confine myself to the second class of objections, which has reference to the peculiar religious tenets professed by the Jews.

It is urged that persons who not only do not acknowledge, but who renounce and deny—and some say vilify—the great Author of the Christian religion, ought not to have any voice in the legislature of a Christian country. On this point arises a question, which I own I find it very difficult to answer. The Legislature of this country,—I mean the two Houses of Parliament,—is not confined to what may be called the Civil Government,—the imposing of burdens which all must bear, and the enacting of laws which all must obey,—but extends to the government of the Established Church also,

even in matters purely ecclesiastical. It is, in fact, at present the *only* ecclesiastical government; since Convocation has long been in a dormant state in England; and, in Ireland, does not exist even in that state. Whoever, therefore, is admitted to a seat in the Legislature, is admitted to a share in the government, not only of the State, but also of the Church; and that, not only in respect of its temporalities, but also of purely ecclesiastical affairs. If, therefore, the question be asked, "What right can a Jew have, under any circumstances, to legislate for a Christian Church?" I know of no answer that can be given to that question, except by asking another: What right has a Roman Catholic to legislate for a Protestant Church? or a Presbyterian for an Episcopal Church? What right, in short, has any man to legislate, in ecclesiastical matters, for any church of which he is not a member?

This anomaly appears to me to exist in all these cases alike. The Jews, it is true, are much further removed from us than any sect of Christians; but it does not follow that they

are more likely to make innovations in our religious institutions. They never attempt to make proselytes, nor to introduce into Christianity any admixture of Judaism; nor is it likely they would attempt, in any way, to interfere with the doctrines or institutions of any description of Christians. Christians, on the contrary, of different persuasions, have often interfered, in the most violent manner, with each other's faith and worship. The Presbyterians did, we know, at one time, when they gained the ascendency in this Country, eject from every parish in England the Episcopalian Clergy; and were in turn ejected by them: and I need not remind your Lordships of the many and violent struggles between Roman Catholics and Protestants in this and in many other Countries. In fact, the nearer approach to each other, in point of faith, between different denominations of Christians, than between Christians and Jews, instead of diminishing, increases the risk of their endeavouring to alter or to overthrow each other's religion. Although, therefore, I cannot, in the abstract, approve of Jews being admitted to legislate for a Christian

Church, or of the ecclesiastical concerns of any Church, being, in any degree, under the control of such as are not members of it, I cannot on that ground consent to withhold civil rights from the Jews, when Roman Catholics and Dissenters have been admitted into Parliament; since, in the case of the Jews, the anomaly is not greater, and the danger is even less. The nearer any class of men approach to ourselves in their faith, the more likely they are to interfere with ours.

If, indeed, an erroneous faith be regarded in the light of a sin against God, and if we were authorized to visit this sin with civil disabilities, we might then look to the greater difference in faith, of the Jews, than of any Christians. But I trust I may dismiss, without argument, the notion of our having a right to punish men on account of their religious opinions, either with a view of forcing them to renounce those opinions, or of inflicting retribution on them for erroneous belief. Often as that principle—which is, in fact, that of persecution—has by many been implied in their practice—no one, I imagine, will be found in the present day, to defend it in

the abstract.* If, indeed, we were to admit the principle of punishing religious error, then, as I have said, the greater error of the Jews might be consistently assigned as a reason for harsher and less indulgent treatment of them than of any sect of Christians. But the only ground which any one will distinctly avow as authorizing penalties and restrictions imposed on any class of religionists, is that of *self-protection*—to guard ourselves either against religious corruption, or against some alarming civil danger. And in this point of view,—looking to self-protection and not to punishment,—it is plain, that the nearer any persons approach to us in religion, the greater the danger, when there is any to be apprehended, of admitting them to an equality of rights with ourselves. We know that the Roman Catholics have persecuted the Protestants, and the Protestants, in

* See Romish Errors, ch. v. § 7. A striking instance of men's tendency to regard with especial abhorrence those who differ from them in religious belief, is to be found in the present use and etymological origin of the word "miscreant;" which, from its primary sense of *mis-believer*, has come to be a term of the highest *moral reproach*.

their turn, the Roman Catholics;—in short, we know that the various sects of Christians have done more, in molesting each other's faith and worship, than any Jews or Pagans have done against Christianity.*

When, therefore, it is said, that although not an exclusively Protestant, we have still an exclusively Christian Legislature, I cannot but confess

* Were it possible for any one to doubt the existence in the present day of such feelings and principles as I have here alluded to, he might but too easily satisfy himself by simply looking to the amount of calumny, insult, and execration, which have been, on party-grounds, within the last few years, (or even, months) heaped on some, not only members but prelates, of the established Church, not more by the avowed enemies of that Establishment, or of the Gospel itself, than by persons professing the deepest veneration, and the most fervent zeal, for both.

Not that this is any just ground of uneasiness in those who have been so assailed. The example, and the warnings, of their great Master, ought to have prepared them to regard it as a blessing "when men hate, and persecute, and speak all manner of evil of them falsely, for his sake." But a proof is thus afforded that the *name* of Christian furnishes no security that the *spirit* of the Gospel will be manifested; since it appears but too plainly that those who thus revile and calumniate every one who will not cooperate with their party, would not have been likely, any more than those who lived three centuries ago, to confine themselves to mere words, if their power were, in these days, equal to their will.

that a Christian Legislature, as such—simply as Christian—does not necessarily afford religious, or even personal, security to a Christian. The most merciless persecutions, we know, have been (it is with shame and sorrow I speak it, but it is notorious) those inflicted by Christians on each other. From the mere circumstance, therefore, of being under a Legislature exclusively Christian, I can derive no security. And, what is more, I am certain that your Lordships think with me in this: for, there is no one of us, professing Protestantism, who would not prefer living in Turkey or Persia, where he would be allowed, on paying a small tribute, the free exercise of his religion, to living under an exclusively Christian government in Spain or Portugal, or any country in which the Inquisition was established. The mere circumstance, therefore, I say, of our having a Christian Legislature, is not of itself any ground of security. But, on the other hand, there is not necessarily any danger, or any incongruity, in persons of any religious persuasion, different from that of the Church of England, legislating upon matters distinct from religion.

With respect to strictly Ecclesiastical affairs —to matters which do relate directly to religion, I admit that there is an incongruity in admitting any one, whether Christian or not, to have a share in the government of a church of which he is not a member; and I take this opportunity of declaring my opinion upon that point to be, that the purely ecclesiastical concerns of the Church, as distinguished from the secular, ought to be intrusted to the care of some persons, whether called Commissioners, or by whatever other name, appointed expressly for that purpose, and who should be members of that Church. But with respect to civil concerns, I do not see that we are justified in excluding from a share in making the laws which they are to obey, or in imposing the burdens which they are to bear, any set of men, whatever their religious tenets may be, until it can be proved that they are likely to abuse their power.

It has been urged, however, that, over and above all considerations of self-protection, the Jews are under God's curse — that they are suffering a Divine judgment—from the effects of which we must not attempt to rescue them.

It is true that they are, nationally, under a judgment. I look on that *nation* as an extraordinary monument of the fulfilment of prophecies, and as paying the penalty of their rejection of the Messiah. But we must be very careful how we, without an express commission, take upon ourselves to be the executioners of Divine judgment, lest we bring a portion of these judgments on ourselves. We are not to act on the will of the Lord, according to our own conjectures as to his *designs;* but according to the *commands* He has expressly given us.* If we justify the

* The last clause of our 17th Article seems to have been added in reference to such as might attempt to justify their own conduct, however immoral, by a reference to the decrees of Providence, on the plea that whatever takes place must be conformable to the divine will. To "do the will of our Heavenly Father," must mean, to do what He, by the light of Revelation or of Reason, announces as *required* of us: otherwise, all men alike, whether virtuous or wicked, would be equally doers of his will. And where his will is *not* thus announced to us, our duty often leads us even to act in opposition to it. For every one would say that a child, for instance, does his duty, in tending the parent on a bed of sickness, and using all means for his restoration; though the event may prove it to have been the will of God that his parent should die. Pilate, on the other hand, was, in a different sense, fulfilling the will of God, while acting against the

exclusion of the Jews from a participation in those civil rights which the rest of us enjoy, on the ground that we are thus fulfilling the judgment of Divine Providence, we must remember that on the same plea the infernal cruelties committed by the Romans and their allies, at the destruction of Jerusalem, might no less be justified. For these also were judgments prophetically denounced against the Jews. Nay, more; the Jews themselves would, on this ground, be justified for the very crime with which they are now upbraided, the crucifixion of Jesus: for this, also, was in accordance with prophecy, and in conformity with the Divine will.

God's will we are sure must be done, and his purposes accomplished, without any need of our aid or consent: but we shall not stand acquitted before Him, on the plea that we are fulfilling his designs, if we presume, uncommissioned, to execute the judgments He has denounced. If it be the will of God that the Jews should

dictates of conscience. And we should remember that the prevalence of the Mahometan religion in many extensive countries that were once Christian, is, in this sense, the will of God.

always be wanderers upon the face of the earth, we may feel assured that they will not long find a resting-place. Whatever the prophecies respecting them do really point to, we may be sure will come to pass. But it is plain, from their having been actually received by some nations to a participation of civil rights, that their perpetual exclusion from such rights can have been no part of those prophecies. And certainly we have received no commission to exclude them. Their religious errors we cannot but condemn; but we must carefully guard against confounding together the two questions; —as to the right of punishing men for their religious errors, however great,—and as to the right of defending ourselves against the consequences of those errors. To claim the former, is the very spirit of persecution.

And if there be any such persons as persecuting Christians in this Country, I scruple not to say that I differ *more* from them in point of religion, than I do from the Jews themselves. The former believe, indeed, that the promised Messiah has arrived; but the others believe in such a Messiah, as in truth never has appeared:

they assign the name and the titles which belong to the true Jesus of Nazareth, to a phantom of their own imagination. *Their* Messiah is not that meek and humble Jesus who told Pilate that "his kingdom was not of this world"—who repressed the mistaken and intemperate zeal of his disciple, when prepared to fight for him, by bidding him "put up his sword into its sheath;"—who prayed for the pardon of his murderers;—and who, when his followers would have called down the fire of heaven on those who rejected Him, rebuked them by saying, "Ye know not what manner of spirit *ye** are of."

I maintain, then, that it is only on the ground of self-protection that we can be justified in imposing, or in continuing (which is the same thing) any restriction on any class of religionists.

But independent of the consideration of any apprehended danger, we are told that we ought to look to the scandal—the indecorum—of admitting to form part of a Christian Legislature those who scoff at the Christian religion, and treat the Founder of it with scorn, as an impostor.

* ὑμεῖς.

Now, if any Jews openly insult our religion, they deserve not merely to be withheld from civil privileges, but to be punished; and under the existing law, they would be liable to punishment for molesting the worship of their neighbours. But if no such charge is established against them, it seems to me that the scandal lies on the other side. For we ought to consider that this is not a Bill to *entitle* a certain number of Jews to a seat in Parliament *as* Jews; but to remove the restriction which prohibits Christians from electing, *if they think fit*, a Jew for their representative. Is it not, then, a greater scandal, that we should think it necessary for the safety of Christianity to impose this restriction—a restriction not so much on the Jews, as on ourselves—to prohibit the people, if they choose it, from returning Jews as their representatives? I do not place the question on the rights of the Jews; nor on their moral or intellectual qualifications, to which such high testimony has been borne by those of their opponents who have more knowledge of them than myself; but I place it on our own rights. For if any Jews are returned to Parliament, it

must be by the choice of a great majority of Christian constituents. I own it does, therefore, appear to me to be a scandal rather on our own faith, to consider it so frail and brittle as not to bear touching — to proclaim that Christianity is in danger unless the hands of Christians are tied to preclude them from the election of Jews.

I am not discussing the question whether Jews are the fittest persons to be returned to Parliament; but whether *Christians* should be *left free* as to that question, or should be prevented from returning them, if they think fit. This Bill, it should be remembered, differs materially, in this respect, from that by which the disabilities of the Roman Catholics were removed; because, by the latter, many persons, being already Peers, were, by that Bill, at once admitted to Parliament. That will not be the case in the present instance; because no Jew can set foot in Parliament until he has been freely elected by a Christian constituency.

But, as I have already stated, I do not think that the Jews, any more than the Roman Catholics, or any Dissenters from the Established

Church, ought to be admitted to legislate, as to matters purely religious, for that Church. I think that every thing relating to the spiritual concerns of the Church should be intrusted to a Commission, or to some Body of men, members of that Church, having power to regulate these concerns in such a manner as may be most conducive to the interests of religion, and to the spiritual welfare of the people. I cannot but think that the members of the Established Church ought to have the same advantage, in this respect, as the Methodists, Quakers, Moravians, and other dissenting sects; who are allowed to regulate the strictly religious concerns of their own religious communities, respectively, without any interference, in respect of these concerns, on the part of persons of a different church.

But no objection on this score can fairly be allowed to operate against the claims of the Jews, more than against various denominations of Christians; to whom the same objection applies with at least equal force, and whose claims have been already admitted. And I cannot but think, therefore, that Jews ought not,

in fairness, to be excluded from all share in imposing the burdens which they are required to bear, and in enacting the laws to which they are to be subject, unless a much stronger case than any that I have yet heard can be made out for that exclusion.

ADDITIONAL REMARKS

ON THE

JEWS' RELIEF BILL.

It was alleged on the opposite side, I. That the case of the Jews and that of the Roman Catholics are not parallel, inasmuch as, 1st, The claims of the Roman Catholics were conceded under the pressure of urgent *necessity*, and no such case of necessity had been established in the case of the Jews; and, 2dly, The Jews are not claiming any rights or advantages *formerly enjoyed* by them in this Country, and of which they have been deprived by positive enactment; but were never in possession of what they now petition for.

All this I readily admit. And I was so far from contending that there is a political necessity for granting the claims of the Jews, that I

expressly stated the reason why the burden of proving a necessity ought to lie *on the other side.* Can it be maintained that a restriction, disability, or inconvenience of any kind, affecting any class of our fellow-subjects, is a good in itself, and ought to be imposed or continued, *without* any necessity? And yet, if this be *not* maintained, it follows inevitably, that he who in any case opposes its removal, is bound to prove its necessity.

To refuse a concession as long as we *can*, and at last to yield, reluctantly, under the pressure of unavoidable necessity, is a course which may sometimes be excused, but which I should have thought would hardly be reckoned a matter of boast It is not surely the course most dignified in the giver, or most conciliating to the receiver of a boon.

Nor, again, did I rest the claim of the Jews on the plea of their having formerly enjoyed the advantages they now crave. On such a plea indeed they could hardly claim common humanity, from most nations of Europe. I looked not to the treatment they have actually received, but to what I thought they *ought* to

have received. They come forward, not as men claiming to be restored to what has been taken from them, but as fellow-creatures and fellow-subjects. And they make their application to *us*, whose religion teaches us to imitate the Samaritan in the parable, who regarded every one as a neighbour whom he had an opportunity of serving; and to treat men, not necessarily, as we have been *accustomed* to treat them, but as *we would have them* treat us, if we were to exchange situations. Now I think if *we* were living in the midst of a people professing some other religion, we should think it reasonable to be admitted to all civil privileges, as long as we left others unmolested in their worship.

II. But the Jews, it was further urged, are the descendants * of those who crucified our Lord;

* The expression actually used was much stronger—"they crucified our Lord:" *they*, that is, their *ancestors*, eighteen centuries ago. But if their descendants at the present day are, on that ground, to be considered (if they do not embrace Christianity) as not only approving of a foul murder, but as actually guilty of it, we surely ought to go further, and punish them with death, as murderers. But if *we* also are to be judged on a like principle, we must be regarded as guilty of the deeds of rapine, cruelty, and murder, perpetrated by our

and as they still regard him as a false prophet, they are not to be put on a level with the Roman Catholics, or any denomination of Christians.

This argument was expanded and dwelt on, and placed in every different shape in the course of the debate; and constituted, indeed, the principal part, in quantity, of what was urged in opposition to the Bill. But no attempt was made to show why, if religious differences are, *at all*, to be made the ground of civil disabilities, and are to be estimated by their intrinsic importance, and not by their political tendency,—why, if that is to be done, the line should be drawn in this particular place more than in another:—why, if the admission of Jews to civil rights is inconsistent with the character of a *Christian* country, the admission of Roman Catholics is not equally inconsistent with that of a *Protestant* country; and so with the rest. Roman Catholics regard the Pope as holding ecclesiastical authority over all Christians; while Protestants regard

ancestors (at a much later period) on the Jews; and of the burning of Anabaptists in the reign of Edward VI. How little would some Christians like to receive the same measure as they deal to others! Matt. vii. 2.

his power as usurped, and its tendency as corrupting: these, again, regard the Reformers as venerable martyrs, while the Romanists hold them pernicious heretics. And many other such points of disagreement exist. Yet it has been decided that these different descriptions of men may live on equal terms as members of the same civil community. It is in vain to say that the Jews differ *more* from Christians than Christians from each other. That does not answer the question, why the line should be drawn at that precise point.

The whole argument, indeed, turns on the confounding together two distinct considerations; the intrinsic *magnitude* of each difference, and the peculiar bearing and tendency of each *kind* of difference. For example, every one knows that, during great part of the last century, many worthy and pious members of the Church of England advocated the claims of the House of Stuart, and aimed assiduously at the restoration of that family. These principles must have been, in the eyes of any loyal subject of King George, (though a member of the same Church), incompatible with their fitness for civil office. Yet if

he had chanced to meet with any of these persons in a foreign country, there is no reason why he might not have joined in their religious worship, provided they would consent to keep clear of political questions. Yet he could not have joined in religious worship with Christians of other persuasions, whose loyalty, and consequent fitness for civil offices, he would never have disputed.

Roman Catholics, Quakers, Anabaptists, Unitarians, &c. cannot all be right in their religious belief; yet all are eligible, by our present laws, to a seat in Parliament; while any one, not possessing a certain amount of *property*, is disqualified even from being a voter. Now, no one surely would say that the possession of a certain amount of property is intrinsically more important than rectitude of religious faith. Every one would admit, in this case, the principle,—the admission of which in fact decides the present question,—that it is the *kind*, and not the *degree*, of agreement or discrepancy, that is in each question to be looked to; and that it is for the civil community to regard merely political qualifications or disqualifications.

III. It was urged, again, that there is no ground for complaining of injustice or intolerance in our precluding any but Christians from civil rights, inasmuch as every master of a family assumes the right of requiring all the members of his household to profess the religion he thinks best; and requires, if he judges it proper, that his servants should attend family-prayers. And certainly every man has this right in his *own house;* nor have any of his servants, or of those who may wish to engage in his service, any rights at all, relatively to his family, except what he may choose to grant them. He may determine what he thinks fit, not only as to the religion, but as to the stature and personal appearance of his servants. The argument is conclusive, if we admit (and not otherwise) that these islands *belong* to the king, or to the King and Parliament, in the same manner as the house or land of any individual belongs to the owner. But no one, I apprehend, will, in the nineteenth century, openly maintain this. And that the above argument proceeds on such a supposition, is a sufficient refutation of it. The King and Parliament are now, at least, universally admitted

to be the governors, not the *owners*, of the Country. And even the most absolute monarch in modern Europe, professes to govern, not (as a master does his servants) for *his own* benefit, but for that of his people; and to impose no burden, privation, or restriction, on any class of his subjects, except what is counterbalanced by the general good of the community.

It would not have been worth while therefore to notice such an argument, but that it has, if rightly applied, great weight on the opposite side.

Every one, it is admitted, should be allowed to do what he will with any thing that belongs to him; provided he does not molest his neighbours. It would be unjust for any of *them* to interfere with the management of his household, on the ground that he does not lay down such rules for it as *they* think best; and to impose restrictions on him, compelling or forbidding him to take into his service men of this or that class or religious persuasion. Now let it be observed that this is precisely the kind of interference *which at present exists*, and which it was the object of the Bill to put an end to. It did

not go to *compel* the King to take Jews into his service, or electors, to return them to Parliament; but to remove *prohibitions*. We may think that a Jew is not the fittest person to hold offices under the Crown, or to sit in Parliament, or to be a servant in a gentleman's family; but *that* is a point for the Crown,—for the electors,—for the master,—to consider. He who would withdraw the matter from their discretion, and limit their choice, by maintaining a restrictive law, which says, "you *shall not* appoint such and such persons," is evidently interfering with their general right to appoint whom they please; and is consequently bound to show that some danger to the community is likely to ensue from leaving them at liberty.

IV. The argument drawn from the Babylonian and other ancient States having employed Jews in civil capacities, without finding them disloyal, or experiencing any disadvantage from their national attachment, or their peculiar opinions and customs, was met by the reply, that the case of those ancient Jews is not parallel to that of Jews in the present day; the former having

not been guilty of the sin of rejecting the Messiah, but being professors of the only true religion then revealed.

This objection was urged by a member of the House, for whose judgment I have great deference,—whom I never differ from without real regret,—and with whom I have been so happy, in almost every other instance, as to agree.

But though I acknowledge the truth of what is alleged in the above objection, I cannot admit that it has *any bearing on the question.*

This, I am aware, may be easily *said,* of any thing. And a mere unsupported assertion that a certain argument does not bear on the question, affords some degree of presumption that it *does;* and that it is not easily refuted; since its irrelevancy, supposing it were irrelevant, would otherwise, one would suppose, have been pointed out.

My reason then for saying that the above objection is irrelevant, is that the whole question turns on the *discrepancy* likely to exist between the Jews and those of another religion; and that, modern Judaism is not *more hostile* to Christianity, than ancient Judaism was to heathen

idolatry. The religious opinions and observances of the Jews, in the days of Daniel for instance, do not appear (it has been urged) to have unfitted them for the civil service of Babylonian or Median princes. And as no one will contend that Daniel, and the rest, were less at variance, in point of religion, with the idolatry of Babylon, than the modern Jews are with Christianity, it is inferred (and surely with great fairness), that these last are as fit for civil employments under Christian princes, as their ancestors, under Pagan.

If the question were, what judgment ought to be formed in a religious point of view, of the ancient and of the modern Jews, respectively, we should of course take into account the important distinction which the advent of Christ places between the two. But in a question respecting civil rights and disabilities, this distinction is nothing to the purpose. To allege that the ancient Jews at Babylon professed a true religion in the midst of falsehood, and that their descendants adhere to an erroneous religion in the midst of truth, does not impair the parallel between the two cases, in respect of the present

argument, so long as it is but admitted (which no one denies) that the Jews are not now led, by their religion, to entertain a greater repugnance for Christianity, than their ancestors did for Paganism.

V. In answer to the argument that other European nations have, without any evil result, admitted Jews to civil rights, it was strongly and repeatedly urged that we ought not to be led by foreigners; and that it is more becoming the dignity of the English nation to set an example to others, than to follow theirs.

Undoubtedly, if, merely because other Countries had adopted any measure, we were required to do the same, without either considering the reasons for it, or judging by the results, this would be justly censured as servile imitation. But nothing of this kind was ever proposed. To observe the results of an experiment tried by our neighbours, and to profit by another's experience, has usually been regarded as characteristic of *wise* men: and if *Englishmen* have not hitherto adopted such a course, it is high time that they should. We have at least a proverbial

expression among us relative to a class of persons who will learn from nothing but their *own* experience; but the title that proverb applies to them is not one of *dignity*.

But let it at least be conceded that we are not to be precluded, *for ever*, from adopting any measure, merely because our neighbours have adopted it. Else, our dread of following the lead of other nations, will compel us to pursue an unwise course whenever they may chance to pursue a wise one. And let some moderate limits be set to the interval which must elapse before we may be allowed, without incurring the charge of political plagiarism, to tread the same path which we have seen others tread with safety.

The dread of thus compromising our dignity, in the case of the alteration of "the style," made us submit for a whole century to an ever-increasing inconvenience, lest we should be suspected of obeying the Pope. And if a similar feeling had been allowed to operate at the time of the Reformation, we should have disdained to appear imitators of Luther. But surely, in these days at least, we may venture to adopt a wise

measure as soon as we perceive it to be so, without fear of our conduct being imputed to any other motive.

VI. Lastly, an objection was urged which appeared to me more worthy of consideration, and which I am inclined to think had more weight with the most discerning portion of the opponents of the Bill, than any other. The Legislature, it was said, by removing this, practically the last, barrier, that excludes any one from office on religious grounds, might be understood by the people to have manifested an indifference to religion, or a contempt for Christianity. The passing of the Bill might be interpreted as a deliberate public declaration, that the rulers of this Country consider religious differences as of no intrinsic importance. And far as such a thought may have been from the minds of those who advocated the measure, they cannot (it was urged) prevent the nation, and the world at large, from drawing, however unreasonably, that inference.

Those who urged this objection, did not, if I rightly understood them, imply that they would

have advocated the *introduction* for the first time, of laws (supposing there had been none before), for imposing civil disabilities on the Jews. But they felt, I apprehend (and such certainly is my own feeling) that the *continuance* of a law may sometimes be advisable, even when its enactment would not have been:—that its abrogation does not necessarily place us in the same situation as if that law had never existed; and that the effect of such abrogation is not always merely *negative,* but may be understood to convey a positive declaration of the sentiments of the Legislature (sentiments often liable to be misunderstood) as to each subject in question.

All this I am ready to admit. And it is a consideration which should never be lost sight of; inasmuch as it dictates an additional caution against unwise enactments, especially in matters pertaining to religion; since there is so much difficulty and danger in retracing our steps. For example, there was a danger (though one which we were undoubtedly bound to encounter,) in removing the penalties imposed on such as should deny the doctrine of the Trinity; lest this repeal should be understood (and probably

it was so understood, by many weak brethren) as a declaration that the doctrine of the Trinity is of no consequence.*

But though I admit the existence of such a danger in the present case, I do not admit that it ought to operate, even in the smallest degree, as an *objection* to the proposed Bill; because the danger in question exists *in a much greater degree as the law now stands,* than it would, if the Jewish disabilities were removed.

If indeed the laws excluded from office all who are not of *the established religion,* the objection would stand good against the relaxation of those laws. There would then be good ground for urging,—what *was* urged at the time—the danger of men's understanding the Legislature to have proclaimed their indifference about religious opinions. Not that this objection against removing religious restrictions

* The custom, now almost disused, of stating, in the *Preamble* of a Bill, the reasons and designs of the framers, might be, I think, in some cases, revived with good effect. Besides other advantages, which it would not be to my present purpose to enumerate, those incidental and undesigned effects on the public mind which I have been alluding to, might then be in great measure obviated.

would not have been, in my mind, greatly outweighed by other considerations: but still I should have admitted it to be a fair and valid objection. I consider however the objection to be much stronger,—the danger much greater,—when *some* restrictions on religious grounds are removed, and some retained, than if *all*, without exception, were removed. For, the Legislature does, now, admit that *religious differences may be a just ground for civil disabilities;* and yet it takes no account of any differences among those who do but profess Christianity. We lay ourselves open therefore to the inference, that we regard it as of little or no consequence what faith a man holds, provided he will acknowledge Jesus as the Messiah.

Suppose the Bill in question passed, which would, virtually, remove, in this Country, *all* disabilities connected with religion; it may be hoped that men of common sense and candour will understand immediately, and the rest, in time, that we have adopted, not such a monstrous conclusion as that religion altogether is a matter of no consequence; but this; that it is a matter between each man's own conscience

and God;—that no one's religious opinions, so long as he does not molest his neighbours, ought to interfere with his civil rights;—and that, as *men*, we should employ our conscience to sit in judgment on ourselves, not on our brother; whose religious errors, however great, and scruples, however foolish, should not prevent us as civil *legislators*, from treating him as a good *citizen*, so long as he shows himself qualified and disposed to act as such.

Such, I say, is the principle on which I think we should, before long, be understood to have acted. But on what principle can we be said to proceed *now?* How are we, as the law at present stands, to guard against the danger of being understood to proclaim the *indifference of all forms of Christianity?* One sect of professed Christians admit the fallibility in religious doctrine, of the Apostles themselves; and hold them inspired merely as to their declaration of the divine mission of Jesus Christ: another class refer to the Holy Scriptures and to nothing else, as the source of religious infallibility: another hold the perpetual inspiration and infallibility of their own Church; and others

maintain the inspiration of Swedenbourg or of Southcote, or of the followers of Mr. Irving. And numerous other differences of no less moment are to be found, unhappily, among professed Christians. "Yet all these," the people may say to the legislature, "all these you have pronounced, by admitting to office every professed Christian, to be matters of no consequence. And though men of any of these different persuasions, however erroneous, may, conceivably, be impressed with a sincere sense of religion, he who is indifferent about all these points, and, like Gallio, 'cares for none of these things,' must be indifferent to religion altogether. That abstract *general* Christianity, which is no particular kind of Christianity, and which pronounces the unimportance of all points on which any Christians have differed, can be only a very thinly-veiled Deism."

What can we answer to such a charge? Can we say, "We do not declare the intrinsic unimportance of religious differences; only, we will not allow them to be taken into account in questions concerning civil rights?" This would be a most reasonable, and to all right-minded

men, satisfactory answer, if *all* religious distinctions whatever were thus waived in reference to civil concerns. But the one last-remaining barrier, which, on that ground, is so earnestly maintained by some,—the restriction affecting the Jews—precludes us from taking our stand on this, the only just and consistent principle. We are thus placed—as those frequently are who adopt half-measures—in a false position; and debarred from occupying the post which is really defensible. We cannot evince our regard for religion, either on the one hand, by drawing the line (as formerly) between what we regard as the true, and all others; since we have now admitted to civil rights the members of various churches: nor again, on the other hand, by drawing the line between religious and civil concerns; since we exclude Jews, avowedly on religious grounds. We are left therefore to attempt drawing the line between the admitted and the excluded, with reference to the *degrees* of religious difference;—to the comparative *importance* of each religious error. And while any class of men are excluded from civil advantages, avowedly on the ground of the *importance*

of their religious errors, we must never expect to convince the world that we do not regard as *unimportant* the errors which we do *not* make a ground of such exclusion.

It appears evident therefore to me, that the danger apprehended from the overthrow of this one remaining religious barrier,—the danger of being understood to proclaim indifference as to religious truth in the minds of our legislators,—is a danger which exists in a much greater degree as the law now stands, than if we were to legislate *throughout* on a consistent and intelligible principle: and that to remove that last barrier, is essential,—precisely because it *is* the *last*,—as a safeguard against that very danger.

The above heads comprise the substance of all that I remember to have heard alleged—all, I mean, of an argumentative character—in opposition to the proposed Bill. And on the most careful and unbiassed re-examination of those arguments, it appeared to me, for the reasons I have assigned, that those of them which are properly applicable to the present question, do

in reality lead to an opposite conclusion to that which they were employed to support.

I think it right to advert in this place to some principles—not indeed substantially novel,—but recently set forth in a manner that calls for respectful consideration, and which are at variance with what I have been maintaining. Not that any reply to the foregoing arguments has been, as far as I know, even attempted: but the principles I allude to would lead, by implication, to a conclusion opposite to mine; and they are the more worthy of notice, as the opposition is not in points of detail, but in fundamentals.

The system of admitting certain classes of men to no more than a state of imperfect citizenship,—or rather, more properly speaking, to the condition of subjects but *not* citizens,—has been vindicated and recommended by the example of the Grecian and other ancient commonwealths; and it has been proposed to make *sameness of Religion* correspond, in modern states, to the sameness of *Race*, among the ancients;—to substitute for their *hereditary citizenship*, the

profession of Christianity in one and the same *National Church.*

Now to me it does appear that this would be the worst possible imitation, of one of the worst of the Pagan institutions; that it would be not only still more unwise than the unwise example proposed, but also even more opposite to the spirit of the Christian Religion, than to the maxims of sound policy.

Of the system itself, under various modifications, and of its effects, under a variety of circumstances, we find abundant records throughout a large portion of history, ancient and modern; from that of the Israelites when sojourners in Egypt, down to that of the Turkish Empire and its Greek and other Christian subjects. And in those celebrated ancient Republics of which we have such copious accounts in the classic writers, it is well known, that a man's being born of free parents within the territory of a certain State, had nothing to do with conferring civil rights; while his contributing towards the expenses of its government, was rather considered as the badge of an alien (Matt. xvii. 25); the imposing of a tax on the

citizens being mentioned by Cicero as something calamitous and disgraceful, and not to be thought of but in some extraordinary emergency.

Nor were the proportionate *numbers* at all taken into account. In Attica the Metœci or sojourners appear to have constituted about a third of the free population; but the Helots in Lacedæmon, and the subjects of the Carthaginian and Roman republics, outnumbered the citizens, probably as much or more than the Roman-Catholics of Ireland the Protestants. Nor again were alien-families considered as such in reference to a more recent settlement in the territory; on the contrary, they were often the ancient occupiers of the soil, who had been subdued by another Race; as the Siculi (from whom Sicily derived its name), by the Siceliots or Greek colonists.

The system in question has been explained and justified on the ground that distinctions of Race implied important religious and moral differences; such that the admixture of men thus differing in the main points of human life, would have tended, unless one Race had a complete ascendancy, to confuse all notions of

right and wrong. And the principle, accordingly, of the ancient republics,—which has been thence commended as wise and good—has been represented as that of making agreement in religion and morals the test of citizenship.

That this however was not—at least in many instances—even the professed principle, is undeniable. The Lacedæmonians reduced to Helotism the Messenians, who were of Doric Race like themselves; while it appears from the best authorities, that the kings of those very Lacedæmonians were of a different race from the People, being not of Dorian but of Achaian extraction. There could not have been therefore, at least universally, any such total incompatibility between the moral institutions and principles of the different Races.

If however in any instances such an incompatibility did exist, or (what is far more probable) such a mutual jealousy and dislike originating in a narrow spirit of clanship—as to render apparently hopeless the complete amalgamation of two tribes as fellow-citizens on equal terms, the wisest,—the only wise—course would have been, an entire separation.

Whether the one tribe migrated in a mass to settle elsewhere, or the territory were divided between the two, so as to form distinct independent States,—in either mode, it would have been better for *both* parties, than that one should remain tributary subjects of the other. Even the expulsion of the Moors and Jews from Spain, was not, I am convinced, so great an evil, as it would have been to retain them as a degraded and tributary class, like the Greek subjects of the Turkish empire.

For, if there be any one truth which the deductions of reason alone, independent of History, would lead us to anticipate, and which again, History alone would establish, independently of antecedent reasoning, it is this: that a whole class of men placed permanently under the ascendancy of another, as subjects, without the rights of citizens, must be a source, at the best, of weakness, and generally, of danger, to the State. They cannot well be expected, and have rarely been found, to evince much hearty patriotic feeling towards a community in which their neighbours look down on them as an inferior and permanently degraded species.

While kept in brutish ignorance, poverty, and weakness, they are likely to feel, like the ass in the fable, indifferent whose panniers they bear. If they increase in power, wealth, and mental development, they are likely to be ever on the watch for an opportunity of shaking off a degrading yoke. Even a complete general despotism, weighing down all classes without exception, is, in general, far more readily borne than invidious distinctions drawn between a favoured and a depressed race of subjects; for men feel an insult more than a mischief done to them; and feel no insult so much as one daily and hourly inflicted by their immediate neighbours. A Persian subject of the great King had probably no greater share of civil rights than a Helot; but he was likely to be less galled by his depression, from being surrounded by those who though some of them possessed power and dignity as compared with himself, yet were equally destitute of civil rights, and abject slaves in common with him, of the one great despot.

It is notorious accordingly how much Sparta was weakened and endangered by the Helots, always ready to avail themselves of any public

disaster as an occasion for revolt. The frightful expedient was resorted to of thinning their numbers from time to time by an organized system of massacre; yet though great part of the territory held by Lacedæmon was left a desert,* security could not be purchased even at this price. We find Hannibal again maintaining himself for sixteen years in Italy against the Romans; and though scantily supplied from Carthage, recruiting his ranks, and maintaining his positions, by the aid of Roman subjects. Indeed almost every page of History teaches the same lesson, and proclaims in every different form, "how long shall these men be a snare unto us? let the people go, that they may serve their God; knowest thou not yet that Egypt is destroyed?" "the remnant of these nations which thou shalt not drive out, shall be pricks in thine eyes, and thorns in thy side."

But besides the other causes which have always operated to perpetuate, in spite of experience, so impolitic a system, the difficulty of *changing* it when once established, is one of the greatest. The false step is one which it is peculiarly difficult to retrace. Men long debarred

* Thucyd. b. iv.

from civil rights, almost always become ill fitted to enjoy them. The brutalizing effects of oppression, which cannot immediately be done away by its removal, at once furnish a pretext for justifying it, and make relief hazardous. Kind and liberal treatment, if very cautiously and judiciously bestowed, will *gradually* and *slowly* advance men towards the condition of being worthy of such treatment: but treat men as aliens or enemies,—as slaves, as children, or as brutes, and they will *speedily* and *completely* justify your conduct.*

But I have said not only that the policy of these ancient states was unwise, but that for Christians to make fellow-membership of the same Church the foundation of that agreement in religion and morals which is to be the test of citizenship, is the *worst* possible imitation of a bad example.

* The Vaudois, oppressed as they have long been by their government, afford, if we may rely on statements which seem well worthy of credit, a remarkable exception to this rule. If the accounts we have be correct, of their near approach, both in the purity of their religion, and in their character, to the primitive Christians, we may infer that in both instances the same religion has operated to produce—as it was designed to do,—the same effects on the character.

The system of the ancient States, bad as it was, was exempt from one great evil,—that of holding out a bounty on hypocritical apostasy. When one race, whether distinguished by the colour of their skin,—their hereditary religious rites,—or otherwise—is excluded, permanently, generation after generation, from civil rights, pernicious and dangerous as such a system is, it is still far preferable to that of making the adherence to a national Church — a Church *open to all* who choose to profess adherence to it—the test of citizenship. For, under this system, whoever is in his heart indifferent about all religion, unscrupulous in point of veracity, and also dead to all sense of disgrace, will not fail to make an outward profession of the national religion, when allured by the prospect of advantage. He may be tempted by the wish for political privileges, or by a desire of inheriting an estate to the exclusion of the rest of his family, (as under the penal code), or of obtaining, if a priest, a pension of 40*l.* per annum. From such men, the ranks of the dominant Church are from time to time recruited. Some of the descendants of such men

are said to have proved valuable and worthy members of our Church. They deserve double credit, for being such in spite of such manifold disadvantages in respect of their parents; but the experiment can hardly be thought a safe and desirable one.

Hypocrisy however, I have heard it urged, can never, do all we can, be rooted out of the world. This is true; and the same may be said of many other evils; but we do not on that account court them as goods, and study to increase their amount. *Unavoidable* evils, or those which can only be avoided by incurring greater, we submit to as far as they *are* unavoidable, and *because* they are so. For instance, no vigilance can completely secure us against false professions of friendship, made from mercenary motives; but there are few persons who would take measures to increase the number of insincere and pretended friends. And yet, in this case, there is some counterbalancing advantage: real services may be done, from mercenary motives, by those whose affection is a mere pretence. And it is the same with insincere pretensions to moral virtue: one who abstains from bad

actions, not through any virtuous principle, but merely for the sake of worldly advantage, is a better member of society, though not a better man, than a bare-faced profligate; and he who relieves the poor, not out of charity but ostentation, benefits them at least, though not himself. But religious hypocrisy is an unmixed evil, and has no countervailing advantage; since an insincere profession of faith benefits no one, and only tends to cast a suspicion, when detected, on the sincerity of others.

But many, it may be said,—and no doubt with truth,—of the Roman Catholics in the times of the laws lately repealed, and of the Jews under the present laws, have embraced our religion with perfect sincerity, uninfluenced by any secular motives. These persons then, by the very supposition, (and probably many *others also* who were *prevented* from becoming converts through a dread of the imputation of unworthy motives) *would* have joined our Church under a system of perfect religious *freedom*. The opposite system therefore has no effect on those of a disinterested character, except to present an additional obstacle to their conversion, and to visit it with an

additional penalty; a penalty the most galling to a generous mind. When a man has the prejudices of education to encounter, and probably the esteem and affection of his dearest friends to forego, he has surely enough difficulties in the way of an unbiassed judgment, and a resolution to act upon it, without our gratuitously superadding a still greater hindrance, —the impossibility of clearing his character from the suspicion, however undeserved, of being a hypocritical and mercenary apostate.

The holding out of secular inducements therefore, in the shape of admission to civil privileges, while it never can produce conformity, except in men of the basest character, must have the effect of preventing it, in many of those of an opposite character. When therefore we divide the subjects of any State into a privileged and a degraded caste, we are guilty of a grievous error; but when, in addition to this, we make a provision for recruiting continually the ranks of the dominant class from the scum and refuse of the depressed class, and at the same time for excluding as far as possible the more high-minded of that depressed class, we have carried

to the utmost the perverse ingenuity of absurd legislation.

It will be observed that in the present argument I have all along spoken of the proposed bond and test of citizenship as consisting in "conformity to one and the same *National Church;*" using this phrase, as being more precise, in preference to that of "profession of Christianity," which evidently must be meant to convey, in the theory alluded to, the very same sense. For it is plain that this is the only sense in which the "profession of Christianity" could tend to secure the very object proposed, of establishing that "agreement in religion and morals" which is to be made the test of citizenship. Nothing, it is evident, would be gained as to this point, by merely establishing the requisition that all the citizens should admit the mere *title* of Christians, while they were left to be Christians of distinct Churches, totally independent of the State and of each other. The thing proposed therefore manifestly is, that some National Church should be established, so comprehensive as to comprise as nearly as possible all Christians; and that all who refused to join

this Church, whether Christians, Jews, or of any other denomination, should be excluded from civil privileges.

This is important to be observed; because though I should gladly see the terms of communion of every church placed on the most comprehensive footing that is compatible with internal peace, there are some differences among Christians (even supposing all difficulties relative to points of faith, to be got over) which I think must, even in the views of the most sanguine, preclude them from ever being members of the same *religious* community. Those, for instance, who maintain the absolute unlawfulness of endowments, could not, in any way that I can conceive, become members of a church possessing endowments. No one should therefore be so far misled by specious language as to calculate on none but Jews and Infidels being, under the proposed system, excluded from civil rights.

But there is another circumstance also which must not be left out of the calculation; viz. that many Christians who might be willing to conform to a Church constituted on certain

principles, provided it were left to their *free choice,* would utterly refuse conformity if enforced under the *penalty of political degradation.* "It matters nothing," says Dean Swift, very truly, "how wide you make the door, for those who take a pride and a pleasure in not coming in." Now the very recipe for producing, in many minds, this pride and pleasure, is, to make conformity a test for admissibility to civil rights. Many would be found stickling for even minute points, (which, under a system of perfect freedom, they would have readily conceded,) lest they should be suspected of yielding from unworthy motives, and purchasing, by concessions against their conscience, the rights that were unjustly withheld. So that even among those brought up as Christians, as well as among Jews, the system would have the effect of alluring into conformity the worldly, the unscrupulous, and the shameless; while on men of the opposite character it would have the opposite effect. Now this, as I have before observed, may be reckoned the very perfection of bad legislation.

Yet unwise and unsafe in a legislative point

of view as such a system has been shown to be, I regard its political inexpediency as a trifle, in comparison of its contrariety to the whole spirit of the Gospel, and the false and injurious impression it tends to create of the character of our religion.

If, when Jesus at his examination before the Roman governor, declared his "kingdom to be not of this world," he is to be considered as having designed a reservation to his disciples of a power to establish, whenever they should be strong enough, the political ascendancy of his religion, reducing all who would not embrace it to the condition of vassals under tribute, without the rights of citizens,—let any one reflect, who attributes to Him this meaning, what a disingenuous subterfuge they are imputing to Him. He meant, I have heard it said, not to claim for Christians, as Christians, any peculiar political power *beyond* what was claimed and exercised by *every* tribe, race, or clan of men, in any Country in which they could possess themselves of sufficient influence. Now every Tribe having been accustomed (as has been above remarked) to establish, wherever they were able, a mono-

poly of political rights for themselves, keeping all other inhabitants of the same territory in a state of tributary subjection, this was probably the very thing apprehended by those who persecuted the early Christians as disaffected persons. They probably understood the renunciation by Jesus of temporal sovereignty, exactly according to the above interpretation; and what is more, it would be hard to prove that they were not justified in their conduct, supposing that interpretation to be a true one. For to what would the disavowal, on the part of Christians, of political designs, have amounted, on that supposition? Merely, that they were content to forego all such claims till they should be strong enough to enforce them: but that whenever, and wherever, they might amount either to a majority, or a sufficiently powerful minority to exercise dominion (as the Lacedæmonians over the Helots, or the Romans over the Provincials,) they would subjugate, in like manner, all who did not belong to their own body, and exclude them from the rights of citizens. These men, it might have been urged, and probably *was* urged by their opponents, profess their readi-

ness to "pay tribute to Cæsar," and to honour kings and all who are in authority: but when they acquire sufficient power, they will doubtless enact that none but those who belong to their own body shall *be* in authority: Cæsar, and every other sovereign and magistrate, they will pronounce disqualified, except on condition of embracing their faith, not only for his office, but for all the rights of a citizen: they really are aiming at the subversion of the existing governments; and only waive their pretensions to political domination till they shall have become strong enough to assert them: we must endeavour therefore, in self-defence, to put down this rising sect.

Such, I have little doubt, were the suspicions entertained (and, if the foregoing interpretation be correct, justly entertained) by the early adversaries of Christianity. And how did the Apostles and early Apologists meet these suspicions? By earnestly disavowing all designs of political interference, and *on that ground claiming exemption* from the censure of the civil magistracy, as not proper objects of political jealousy, since they did not aim at political

ascendancy.* But they *did* aim at political ascendancy, if, while seeking by conversions to increase their numbers, they secretly designed to monopolize, as soon as they should be strong enough, the rights of citizenship, and to hold in subjection as vassals all who did not belong to their Body.

The conclusion therefore seems inevitable, unless we attribute *insincerity* to the early Christians, and to their Master, that his declarations cannot bear the interpretation I have alluded to; and that we must understand his description of his kingdom as not of this world in the plain simple sense, as debarring all Christians from any claim to monopolize political power to themselves, either as Christians or as members of any particular church;—from making subscription to their creed a test of citizenship. If He and his Apostles did *not* mean to forbid this, I am at loss to conceive in what terms they *could* have forbidden it.

Of course it was to be expected, that as

* I need not cite the numerous and well-known passages to this effect which occur in the Acts, and in many of the Epistles.

Christianity succeeded in improving the tone of morals, many abominations—such as gladiatorial shows and impure rites—which were tolerated or even enjoined among Pagans, would, very justly, be prohibited by Christian legislators: but it is *as* being *immoral and pernicious actions* that we are bound as legislators to the forcible suppression of these. It sounds, indeed, very plausible to speak of political society being ordained for higher purposes than the temporal welfare of mankind, and the security of their persons and property;—the purposes, as they have been contemptuously styled, of mere police or traffic: but after all, it is plain that external conduct alone comes directly and completely within the reach of the *coercive* power with which the magistrate is armed; and external conduct does not constitute virtue and religion. The very same action may be morally virtuous or vicious according to the motives of the agent; and legislative enactments do not control motives. *All* lawgivers forbid us to *steal* our neighbour's goods; but it is only a divine lawgiver that can effectually forbid us to covet them. It sounds

well to speak of political society deciding what is or is not essential and eternal, and giving to its decisions the sanction of the truth of God: but after all, this sanction can only extend to those who *believe* such and such an institution to be conformable to the truth of God: and a rational belief of this must be based on evidence very different from that of its being the law of the land. The legislator may, indeed, take upon him to choose for the people what their religion shall be, and to declare authoritatively that it is sanctioned by the truth of God: but though he can enforce outward conformity, he cannot enforce well-grounded conviction.

And it should be remembered, that since it is a point of morality to "submit to the ordinances of man for the Lord's sake," and to "render unto all their due, tribute, to whom tribute is due, fear, to whom fear, honour, to whom honour," it follows that, if it be a part of the province of the civil magistrate to enforce not only abstinence from crime, but religious and moral agreement among all the citizens, then, those Christians who adhered to their faith under Pagan governments, were trans-

gressing the precepts of their own Apostles; and the same with Christians in Mahometan, and with Protestants in Roman Catholic States. For *right* and *obligation* must be reciprocal: wherever the lawful magistrate has *right* to *enjoin,* the subject must be *bound* to *obey.*

The Apostles, therefore, it is plain, must have had a far different notion of the proper province of the civil magistrate; to whom they exhorted their followers to render the obedience due, without the least idea that this extended to matters of religion. For we cannot surely suppose that the Apostles intended to assign unquestioned authority in religious concerns to the magistrate, *provided he were a Christian,* but *not otherwise.* This would, indeed, have been to make Christ's kingdom emphatically a "kingdom of this world;"—by assigning to a Christian magistrate a degree of political power which they denied to a heathen;—and also a "kingdom divided against itself;" since it would have sanctioned the practice of which history presents us with so many examples, of Christians of one persuasion employing the secular arm to put down those of another.

The mode by which the maintainers of the above theory usually endeavour to avoid this difficulty is by alleging, that since, after all, we must obey God rather than man, subjects are bound to follow the magistrate's directions in respect of religion so far, and only so far, as they in their conscience believe these to be conformable to the Divine will. This may safely be conceded; since it requires no more compliance towards the magistrate than is due towards each of our neighbours; whom we clearly ought to agree with in respect of religion, so far as we conscientiously believe them to be in the right. But this also ought surely to be conceded; that a man who conscientiously differs in his religious belief, either from the magistrate or from any of his neighbours, ought not to be either compelled to disown his belief, or, so long as he shows himself an orderly, peaceable, and upright member of society, to be excluded from the rights of citizenship in all that relates to temporal concerns. Now this is all I contend for. And here it may be proper to observe, that in protesting against the claim of the civil

magistrate to prescribe to his subjects what shall be their religious faith, I have confined myself to the consideration that such a decision is *beyond the province* of a secular ruler; instead of dilating, as some writers have done, on the impossibility of having any ruler whose judgment shall be *infallible*. That infallibility cannot be justly claimed by uninspired man, is indeed very true, but nothing to the present purpose. A man may claim—as the Apostles did—infallibility in matters of faith, without thinking it allowable to enforce conformity by secular coercion; and again, he may think it right to employ that coercion without thinking himself infallible. In fact *all* legislators do this in respect of temporal concerns, such as confessedly come within the province of human legislation. Much as we have heard of *religious* infallibility, no one, I conceive, ever pretended to universal *legislative* infallibility. And yet every legislature enforces obedience, under penalties, to the laws it enacts in civil and criminal transactions; not, on the ground of their supposing themselves exempt from error of judgment; but because they are bound to

legislate—though conscious of being fallible—according to the best of their judgment; and to enforce obedience to each law till they shall see cause to repeal it. What should hinder them, if religion be one of the things coming within their province, from enforcing conformity on the same principle to their enactments respecting that? A lawgiver sees the expediency of a uniform rule with regard, suppose to weights and measures, or to the descent of property; he frames, without any pretensions to infallibility, the *best* rule he can think of; or perhaps, merely a rule which he thinks as good as any other; and enforces uniform compliance with it: this being a matter confessedly within his province. Now if religion be so too, he may feel himself called on to enforce uniformity in that also; not believing himself infallible either in matters of faith or in matters of expediency; but holding himself bound, in each case alike, to frame such enactments as are in his judgment advisable, and enforce compliance with them; as King James in his prefatory proclamation respecting the Thirty-nine Articles announces his determination to

allow of no departure from them whatever. I do not conceive that he thought himself gifted with infallibility; but that he saw an advantage in religious *uniformity*, and therefore held himself authorized and bound to enforce it by the power of the secular magistrate. The whole question therefore turns, not on any claim to infallibility, but on the extent of the province of the civil magistrate, and of the applicability of legal coercion.

I cannot quit this important subject, which has detained me longer than I had designed, without noticing an ingenious and well-written pamphlet, "On the Law of Religious Libel," under the name of John Search.* In the author's general conclusion I heartily concur; and indeed I hardly know on what principle the present vague and inconsistent state of the law can be vindicated. But there are two errors in the work, which, though incidental, and not affecting the general conclusion, are of too much intrinsic importance to be left unnoticed.

The first is, where it is assumed, casually and incidentally, that the *fact* of Christ's miracles

* See Edinburgh Review, No. 118.

was *denied* at the time by those who rejected Him. It is strange that any educated man should be so ignorant, or should calculate on his readers being so ignorant, as not to know that the evangelists, with one voice, and repeatedly, describe the adversaries of Jesus as agreed in fully admitting the miracles,—all but that of his own resurrection,—and ascribing them to the agency of demons commanded by magical arts.

It is true we have no right at once to assume the veracity of these Christian writers; but, on the other side, to take for granted at once that their accounts are the reverse of the truth, is palpably begging the question. And if we seek for evidence of the denial of the miracles by adversaries, at the time, we find it all on the opposite side. All the fragments and notices that have come down to us of the early attacks and apologies; all the traditions of the Jews respecting the belief of their ancestors, concur in confirming the accounts of the Evangelists as to this point; that the unbelievers of those days admitted the miracles, and ascribed them to magic. These Jewish traditions on the subject have been collected into a volume, which has been for ages in

circulation among that people, and which has been not long since translated into English by some person who thought it would do a disservice to Christianity, under the title of the "Gospel according to the Jews." At whatever time the volume was compiled (which is uncertain, though it is unquestionably very ancient) it must have been compiled from existing traditions, of no later date than the first origin of Christianity; since it is morally impossible, that if the first opponents of Jesus had denied the fact of the miracles, all traces of their belief should have died away, and the hypothesis of magic have been devised afterwards, and substituted for one so much more decisive. And so minutely does this volume coincide with the assertion of the evangelists, that it contains a laboured attempt to impugn the fact of the resurrection, while it denies no other miracle, and expressly mentions several.

Now the whole of this branch of evidence is put on a totally different footing when it is thus ascertained that the miracles were admitted by opponents at the time; for, credulous as that People were in regard to magic, this plea would

never have been resorted to if they could have thrown even any suspicion on any one of the miracles; since the hypothesis of *magic* only went to prove that a man who wrought miracles *might possibly* not come from God, and left the question, whether he did or not, to be decided on other grounds: whereas the detection of a single *imposture* would have settled the question at once, and proved decisively that he *could not* be from God.

A position then so rashly assumed (to say the least) without evidence, and *against* evidence, and which goes to change the whole face of the argument from miracles, ought to be immediately and publicly abandoned.

The other error in the work alluded to, is a mistaken and invalid objection to a remark,—a very important one,—which appeared in an article in the London Review,* to this effect,—that in many cases, and not least in questions concerning the divine origin of Christianity, a

* In 1829. Saunders and Otley. There is another periodical under the same title, at present, with publisher, conductor, principles, and, in short, every thing but title, totally different.

well-grounded belief may be based on premises whose truth we have not and could not have ascertained for ourselves, by personal investigation; and which again we do not take on trust from the testimony of those whom we have chosen to follow implicitly, but which we believe on *uncontradicted* testimony, inasmuch as the statements in question are open to every one's investigation, and *would*, we are sure, be impugned by many, if they were at all doubtful. The distance of the earth, for instance, from the sun is believed, and believed on good grounds, by many who are incompetent to make the requisite observations and calculations for themselves, not on the bare authority of certain astronomers, but on the tacit confirmation of this by all the rest, many of whom would, we are sure, be glad to be able to rectify, if they could, any error into which their rivals in the pursuit of scientific fame might have fallen.

Now, in the pamphlet alluded to, it is contended that this does not apply in the case of any evidences relative to Christianity, because the *laws forbid* the publication of a *denial of the truth* of Christianity. But this objection rests on a

palpable mis-statement of the argument, which refers to such points only as all persons are fully at liberty to discuss, even under the most rigid interpretation of the law. For instance, the existence and antiquity of certain Greek and Latin MSS., the fidelity of translations, the testimonies of Pagan writers, the existence of various monuments, &c., are points necessarily involved in the discussion of the external evidences of Christianity; and yet few of the educated, and none of the uneducated classes, ever saw an ancient Greek MS., or could read it, if they did: few can attest from their own personal knowledge, even the existence of such a city as Jerusalem. And yet it is maintained—and very rightly—that we are justified in believing matters of this kind, on the testimony of those who *have* made the investigation, when no one has attempted to deny them; for all men *are* fully at liberty to question the genuineness of any ancient MS., or the fidelity of any particular translation, &c. The objection, therefore, is wholly inapplicable.

But the general conclusion as to the law of libel is, I think, fully established; and I would

add, that the present state of things, in reference to that law, is such as a judicious advocate of Christianity must lament, and an insidious opponent ought to rejoice in secretly, while he publicly complains of it; for it does in fact enable him, with a very moderate exercise of caution, to urge, in substance, *all* he has to say against our religion, and, at the same time, to hint that he *could* say much more, if the law would allow him; and that Christians dare not run the hazard of a perfectly free discussion.

There is, however, in reference to the removal of the civil disabilities of Jews, one consideration of great weight, and which, accordingly, I noticed early in the Speech, as one which would have constituted, considered in the abstract, a valid objection to the measure; viz. the anomaly of making persons of a different religion eligible to situations in which they may have to *legislate*, in all matters, ecclesiastical as well as temporal, *for our Church.*

The anomaly, however, already exists: the exclusion of the Jews serves not to prevent, but only to disguise,—perhaps dangerously dis-

guise,—any danger that may arise from it. No practical objection, therefore, can fairly be raised, on this ground, against the present measure ;—a measure which, by rendering the anomaly, though not at all more real, yet more glaring, may answer the beneficial purpose of calling our attention to the providing a rational and effectual remedy. To attempt promoting the security and the welfare of the Church, by excluding from *all* power,—civil as well as ecclesiastical,—those who are not members of it, would now be not less vain than unjust. But to aim at the same object, by entrusting the regulation of *ecclesiastical* affairs (as contra-distinguished from secular) to the hands of members of the Church, would, I am confident, be as practicable as it would be evidently reasonable.

And fortunately, the very circumstance which makes more glaringly evident the present incongruous condition of the Church, removes at the same time the chief obstacle to an alteration of that condition. It seems strange, at the first glance, that the Church should not possess the same advantage which is enjoyed by every other society,—whether religious, civil, literary,

scientific, or of whatever other description,—of having its internal regulations revised, from time to time, with a view to the advancement of the proper objects of the society. The obstacle to this has been, that *other* objects were connected with these;—other interests involved.

As long as the members of a certain church possess a *monopoly of political power*, there is the more reason for watching with a jealous eye, with a view to political objects, its internal regulations; and for requiring it to be governed on political principles.

But now that this monopoly is at an end, it seems but reasonable that the internal affairs of the Church should be regulated (as formerly) by her own members; and without exciting, as before, any of that jealousy which is not felt towards the Methodists, or the Quakers, or again towards our several endowed Universities.

It is from my anxiety to inculcate these principles, and from their close connexion with a portion of what has been above said, that I have subjoined the observations I made in the House,

on the occasion of presenting a petition from the Clergy of the diocese of Kildare.

A petition of the same general tendency had been just before presented, and attention invited to the matter of it, by the Bishop of London.

OBSERVATIONS

MADE

ON PRESENTING A PETITION TO THE HOUSE OF LORDS

FROM

THE CLERGY OF THE DIOCESE OF KILDARE,

RELATIVE TO

CHURCH REFORM.

AUGUST 7, 1833.

Εἰ δέ τι περὶ ἑτέρων ἐπιζητεῖτε, ἐν τῇ ἐννόμῳ ἐκκλησίᾳ ἐπιλυθήσεται. Acts xix. 39.

"Cum per se res mutentur in deterius, si consilio in melius non mutentur, quis finis erit mali?" Bacon.

A SPEECH,

&c. &c.

MY LORDS,

I HAVE the honour to present to your Lordships a petition from the Archdeacon and Clergy of the Diocese of Kildare, signed by the Archdeacon in their names; and, as the petition is very short, I will read the whole of it: It states—

"That your petitioners, aware that every thing human, civil, or ecclesiastical, requires, from time to time, revision and correction, do not consider the United Church of England and Ireland exempt from this principle.

"That, in the humble opinion of your petitioners, the ecclesiastical laws, by which the

Church is now governed, require better adaptation to the altered circumstances of the Country.

"That the practice of our Ecclesiastical Courts, in matters connected with the welfare of the Church and best interests of religion, has ceased to be conducive to the important objects for which they were originally established.

"That the Church of England and Ireland, viewed as an important integral part of the Church of Christ, ought, as such, to enjoy the privilege permitted to other Churches and religious Bodies, of being governed by such laws as best promote the performance of the sacred duties required of her ministry, and provide for the spiritual discipline of her members.

"That they consider it highly important to the safety and prosperity of his Majesty's dominions that the Church should be so governed, inasmuch as the doctrines and precepts which she maintains, when duly inculcated, must always exercise the most important influence over the consciences of his

Majesty's subjects; teaching them, on the highest principle, the duty of submission and obedience to the laws which the wisdom of the Legislature may enact.

"Your petitioners, therefore, humbly pray that your Lordships, if it should be deemed advisable, will be pleased to enact such laws as may appear most calculated to promote the spiritual improvement of our Church, and to renovate and reform its government, so as to render it more suitable and better adapted to the altered circumstances of the country."

Now, my Lords, I am desirous to mention that the prayer of this petition, though entirely in accordance with the views of the Bishop of the Diocese of Kildare,—as I learn by a letter from himself,—yet was drawn up and agreed to at a public meeting, without any suggestions from that Venerable Prelate, and is the spontaneous act of the petitioners themselves.

In presenting this petition to your Lordships, I cannot refrain from troubling you with a few observations on the very important subject to which it refers. I beg to observe, however, that

in stating what I believe to be the sentiments of the petitioners, I speak merely my own belief, as grounded on my own observation;—and, I must add, no hasty or careless observation,—but not as authorized by any express commission from them.

I can confidently say, then, that I am satisfied they are not, in the smallest degree, ill-disposed towards the system established by our Protestant Reformers, and towards the fundamental doctrines of the Church of England and Ireland. I say, confidently, my Lords, that they have no hostile feeling of this kind; and that even whatever difference on any point of religion may exist between any of them, they are all agreed in sincere attachment to the system.

I am perfectly and entirely convinced also, that, as far as civil government is concerned, there is not a more loyal Body of men living. Whatever differences of opinion they may entertain with respect to several political questions, of this I am convinced, that they venerate the Constitution of this Country,—and, as a part of that Constitution, the union of the two islands.

Any disturbance of the union between Great Britain and Ireland, either in Church or State, is the last thing they would seek.

I am convinced, also, that they have no thought of complaining of any act of encroachment on the part of the civil Government in purely ecclesiastical affairs, — in matters altogether spiritual; and that they have no idea themselves of encroaching on civil affairs. They have no wish, I conceive, of creating any thing like an *imperium in imperio*,—a Body empowered, like the original Convocation, exclusively to control the temporalities of the Church. Nor do they again complain that the civil Power is disposed to do too much in religious matters. On the contrary, they perceive that the Parliament of this country, although the fountain of legislation in all matters, ecclesiastical as well as civil, has not considered the more purely ecclesiastical matters as coming properly and suitably within its province. No one has the *power,* at present, to interfere in the affairs of Church government, except the civil legislature ; yet the petitioners feel that Parliament,—even when it consisted, as formerly, exclusively of professed

members of the Church,—has always shown a backwardness in interfering with subjects connected with the forms and internal regulations of the Church.

I understand then the wish of these petitioners to be, that some inquiry should be instituted, or some Commission appointed to make inquiries, with a view to making such alterations in these matters as may be deemed expedient. They are not, however, as far as I know or believe, anxious for any great or fundamental changes; nor, indeed, for any changes at all, if, upon inquiry, they shall be considered unnecessary. But they feel,—and it is a feeling which pervades the minds of many men of scrupulous conscience,—that there is at present no individual, or Body of individuals, to whom any questions of doubt and uncertainty, or of scruple and objection, may be referred,—no constituted Authority to whom application can be made, in order to determine, on examination, whether an alteration is needed or not. And I am myself convinced, that it is highly desirable, (without pretending to say whether any change is necessary or not,) that as regards proposed alterations

in the Liturgy, or in the Articles, or the appointed Lessons, or the authorized version of the Scriptures,* and other matters of a like description, there should be some responsible person, or Body of men, to whom such points might be referred for examination and inquiry, in order to determine whether alterations are or are not called for.

It should be observed, my Lords, that serious alarm may be excited, even in reference to trivial matters, if there is no competent authority to whom to apply. Some points of exceedingly small importance in themselves may be left in such a state as to be indicative of a neglect and apathetic disregard of Church-affairs; and it is this point particularly which I imagine the petitioners regard with anxiety. They do not, I apprehend, object to the main principles of the Articles of the Church: yet they cannot, I think, but consider that some of these Articles require revision. For example,—one of them contains a declaration in respect of

* This last point, it should be observed, is one which concerns not only members of our Church, but also Dissenters; almost all of whom use our version.

the Homilies, that they contain "godly and wholesome doctrine, and necessary *for these times*." Now it never can be contended that the framers of the Articles designed to exact of all future generations such a nugatory declaration, as that of the suitableness of these Homilies for the time of Edward VI. Their intention must have been, either that new Homilies, suited to the wants of successive periods, should be put forth from time to time, or else (supposing no need of such a procedure to arise) that the Article in question should be withdrawn. Neither of these has been done: and it is, therefore, indicative of a general neglect of the affairs of the Church, that these Homilies are left in the state in which they were at first framed, though every thing else has been changing around them,—that the Article relating to them remains unaltered,—and that no Power or Authority exists whose business or province it is to look to such matters.

The Lessons, again, appointed to be read,—the authorized version of the Scriptures,—and the Liturgy,—may be, all of them, just as perfectly adapted for the present day, as they were

for the age in which they were framed; but what, I conceive, the petitioners complain of is, that there is no person, or Body of persons, to decide whether they are so or not. If any word be obsolete, or if any doubt exists as to the propriety of a phrase, which it may by some be thought advisable to change, there is no one competent to decide the point; there is no Body of men whose proper province it is to inquire as to the propriety of making the alteration.

Both these petitioners, and, as far as I can learn, many of the Clergy both of Ireland and of England also, feel this strongly in their own minds, and consider it to be, in others, one of the great causes of dissent and defection, or of indifference towards the Established Church. It is a common feeling (whether well or ill-grounded) in the minds of many men, that incongruities and inconveniences do exist, and that a reform, greater or less, is required; but the natural question is, how, and by whose authority, is it to be accomplished? And there are many who are open to a feeling of disgust from the knowledge of there being no such

competent Authority to effect that object. There are many, perhaps, of these persons who do not seek unnecessary change; and who would even be perfectly satisfied, though on this or that point no alteration were made, provided it were certified on proper authority, that every thing, in respect of any such point, was right, and that no alteration in it was desirable. If any building were but suspected of being in a state of dangerous decay, much alarm would be excited by its being understood that no workmen could, or would, be sent up to inspect the condition of its roof. But if such an examination did take place, and the result was, that every beam and rafter was found perfectly sound, and needing no repairs, no one would say that the sense of security thus obtained was too dearly purchased.

Such are the feelings with which I conceive these petitioners come forward. I know that the same feelings are entertained by many Clergymen of my own diocese;—it is, therefore, not a feeling peculiar,—nor is there, indeed, any reason why it should be peculiar,—to the Clergy of Kildare. I believe, indeed, that the same exists to a great degree, not only in Ireland, but

in England also; and I would beg to suggest that this is a state of things which ought not to be suffered to continue.

I am addressing your Lordships, not as persons who regard the Church as a political engine, rather than as a religious institution;—not as men zealous for the Establishment, merely *as* an establishment;—as men anxious for the means, and indifferent to the end;—as careful guardians of Church-property, merely as property; without any regard for the great objects for which the Church was instituted and endowed,—the moral and religious improvement of the people;—as caring, in short, more about "the gold of the Temple," than "the Temple that sanctifieth the gold,"—but I address your Lordships as men fully sensible that the important questions relative to the Church, which have lately been, and which are likely to be, anxiously discussed in this House, derive nearly the WHOLE OF *their interest* from their connexion with the matters to which this petition relates; the *utility*, in a religious point of view, of the Church Establishment. Whatever differences of opinion may exist, as to the best means for

securing that end, I trust your Lordships are agreed as to the paramount importance of the end itself. I, therefore, ask your Lordships,—with a view not only to the *safety*, but also to the *security* of the Church,—its immunity not only from danger, but from apprehension of danger,—whether the state of things, which I have been describing, should still continue?

I trust such steps will be taken that the Church may be made not only secure, but efficient; so as to satisfy and to benefit, as far as possible, all those who are willing to be satisfied. I trust the suggestions conveyed in this petition will not meet with neglect, or inattention; and that some measures, in accordance with it, will be resolved on. I presume not—nor do the petitioners—to dictate to this House what particular course should be adopted, but only to suggest that *some* should be adopted, —for instituting inquiry into those matters connected with the religious functions of the Church, which may be considered as needing inquiry. Then, should it even be decided, that nothing whatever should be altered, but on the contrary, that every thing had better remain as it is, such

a declaration, coming from a competent authority, would satisfy the minds of many persons who are now not satisfied; because, then, they would be given to understand, that if alterations were not made, it was from its being ascertained, on deliberate inquiry, that they were not needed; and not merely because there are no persons duly authorized, who care to introduce them.

APPENDIX

TO

THE SPEECH ON THE PETITION FROM THE CLERGY OF KILDARE.

I HAVE only to add, that the views which I took this occasion to express, were not recently and hastily taken up—without consideration of difficulties and objections—to be as hastily abandoned as soon as objections are pointed out; but are the result of long and earnest reflection, and deliberate conviction; a conviction, every day more strongly impressed on my mind, that the present anomalous situation of the Church, tends not only, in many ways, to diminish its efficiency, but is pregnant with continually-increasing danger and discredit. By the Church, I understand, not its ministers and

its endowments, any farther than these are *means* towards an end; but the Christian Community, considered as such. Any kind of spoliation of the Church, no one can deprecate more than myself; but I consider as the worst kind of spoliation, any thing that tends to impair the efficiency, in a religious point of view, of the Establishment.

There may be perhaps some, though I trust not many, even of the professed friends of the Establishment, who will ridicule the expression of such sentiments; who perhaps laughed secretly at their own expressions of earnest zeal in the cause of the Church; and laugh openly at one who refers the importance of that cause to the spiritual value of that Church. To seek "first the kingdom of God and his righteousness" was not, in our Saviour's time, a principle universally approved or respected. He did not however the less steadily maintain his principles in defiance of censure and of scorn: "and the Pharisees, which were covetous, heard these things, and they derided Him."

But independent of the real dislike or indifference to religion which may exist in any

pretended friends of the Establishment, the popular use of language presents an impediment to the inculcation of just notions on this subject.

By "the affairs of the Church" is too often understood "Church-*property*" alone. And I am the more anxious to bring forward the views which (in common with many other members of the same religious community) I entertain, in order that we may not be misunderstood, as seeking to set up an "*imperium in imperio*;"—to withdraw the temporalities of the Establishment from the control of the general legislature of the Country;—or to confer civil authority on some clerical Body. Never was there a time when men were more jealous of being priest-ridden,—or less in danger of it. It is therefore the more important that those who contemplate inquiries and regulations in such matters only as pertain to every *religious* community, strictly *as such*, should come forward to explain distinctly what their views are; lest different ones should be falsely imputed to them.

"But things have gone on very well," (I have been told) "for a long time past, just as they are: why then seek for any change?" Now

the question as to the "*well;*"—how far all matters pertaining to the Church are in a satisfactory state,—is a matter of *opinion;* and on which I am constrained to acknowledge, though with unfeigned wonder, that opinions differ: but the question as to the "*length of time*" that things have been on their present footing, is a question of *fact;* and one on which there can, I conceive, be but one decision. It is but a very few years that Parliament, which is in practice the only legislature for the Church, has consisted of any persons avowedly neither members nor friends of the Church. But "if these" (I have been told) "should obtain a predominating influence, and should use it to attempt any innovations in the Establishment, it will *then* be for its friends to resist any such attempt." This seems to me, I must confess, like beginning to prepare an ark amidst the rage of a deluge; or commencing a countermine when the match is applied to the train.

I confess, however, that it is not, solely or chiefly, from any direct result of the change in the constitution of Parliament, that I am led to apprehend, as unavoidable, some change in the

existing constitution of the Church. At least, if the altered character of the Civil Legislature is likely to accelerate such a change, it must be, principally, by rendering more glaringly and more universally *apparent* that want of an Ecclesiastical Legislature, which, virtually and in practice, has long existed. Complaints of want of reform, or of inquiry, or of regulating power, cannot indeed be so easily answered by a reference to Parliament, now that Parliament no longer excludes those who are not professed members of the Church. But I feel convinced that even if Parliament had remained unaltered, some inspection into Ecclesiastical affairs would have been more and more loudly, and at length effectually, called for. The number is great, and is daily increasing, of those who think either that some change is desirable, or that it is unavoidable, or that, if neither desirable nor unavoidable, it can only be escaped, by means of a declaration, issuing from some competent authority, such as may satisfy men's minds. I know too, that such views are not confined to the adversaries of our Church, but are entertained by many of its friends, both lay

and clerical. And what is more, some of these, whose sincerity I cannot doubt, are disposed to advocate what appear to me such destructive innovations, that for this very reason (though I know it has an opposite effect on some minds) I am even much the more anxious to come forward as early and as strenuously as possible, to join with the more rational and sober-minded, in advocating such timely and moderate measures, as can alone, I am persuaded, preserve us from having intemperate and dangerous ones forced upon us from other quarters. We have only the alternative of calmly examining for ourselves the walls of our fortress, and deliberately repairing them where they may be found decayed, or of waiting to have them rashly undermined from within, or battered down by assailants from without.

For a fuller discussion of this subject, the reader is referred to a masterly and judicious pamphlet on "Church Government," by the Rev. Dr. Dickinson.*

* I think it but right to mention, that though the author is one of my chaplains, the work, of which I saw no part till published, was written in Ireland, while I was attending par-

With those who deprecate wanton or violent changes, I fully concur. But those who declaim on the advantages of preserving every thing unchanged, must be aware, that their views, however right, are purely speculative; unless indeed they are really ignorant, not only of the designs of our early Reformers, but also of the great, though undesigned changes, even in the system those Reformers framed, which have since then crept in, incidentally, through the agency of the "greatest Innovator, Time."* To say that no changes shall take place, is to talk idly: we might as well pretend to control the course of the Sun. To say that none shall occur *except* such as are undesigned and accidental, is to say that though a clock may gain or lose indefinitely, at least we will take care it shall never be regulated. And "since" (says Bacon) "things alter for the worse spontaneously, if they be never altered for the better designedly, where is the evil to end?"

liamentary duties in England; and contains, I am persuaded, the unbiassed and long-matured opinions, not only of the writer, but of several other of the most enlightened of the Irish Protestants.

* Bacon.

With these sentiments, I should feel myself wanting in duty to my Master, if I suffered any regard for personal ease or credit—any dread of popular obloquy or persecution—any fear of giving offence even to those whom I should be most unwilling to offend—or, in short, any personal consideration whatever, of a temporal character, to stand in the way of my exertions in such a cause, if the state of things which I have been deprecating, should continue, while any, the most painful sacrifices,—the most persevering efforts, on my part, remained untried.

THE END.

R. CLAY, PRINTER, BREAD-STREET-HILL.

Princeton Theological Seminary Libraries
1 1012 01196 6332

